

Advanced Thought

A Monthly Journal of

The New Thought, Practical Psychology, Yogi
Philosophy, Constructive Occultism,
Metaphysical Healing, Etc,

WILLIAM WALKER ATKINSON, Editor
ARTHUR GOULD, Business Manager

Vol. II.

APRIL, 1917

No. 2

CONTENTS

Chips from the Old Block . . .	William Walker Atkinson .	51
The Tyranny of Terms . . .	William Walker Atkinson .	52
Numerology	Clifford W. Cheasley . . .	61
More About Mind-Reading . . .	Theron Q. Dumont . . .	63
Why Was the World Created? . .	Yogi Ramacharaka . . .	66
The Psychology of Woman . . .	Margaret Van Norden . .	73
The Raw Materials of Mind . .	William Walker Atkinson .	77
Premortem Agreements	Arthur Gould	81

HEART-TO-HEART TALKS

(By the Editor)

Where I Stand	84	"The New Thought Jarley's Wax-Works"	84
The Case of Arthur Crane	85	About Numerology	89
Gesundheit!	89		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(Conducted by the Editor)

Reconciliation	90	A Detail of Healing	91
Psychic Phenomena	91	Was Homer Inspired?	91
New Thought and "The Sabbath" .	92	The Editor is Sat Upon	93
The Root of Evil	94	Good Stuff	93
Anti-Hypnotism	94	Positivity	94
Faith and Bigotry	96	Survival of the Fittest	95

MISCELLANY, QUOTATIONS, ETC.

Ecclesiastical Signposts	60	No Rash Statements for Him . . .	72
Eternality	76	Good Advice	82
Four States of Belief	96	Self-Reliance	97

Subscription Rates, Etc.

Single Copies, Ten Cents. Yearly Subscription (12 issues) \$1.10
(In United States, Alaska, Cuba, Porto Rico, Mexico, Hawaii and Phillipines)

In Canada, \$1.35 a year. In Foreign Countries, \$1.50 a year

(Copyright 1917, by Advanced Thought Publishing Co.)

Entered as Second-class matter, July 17, 1916, at the postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Address all Subscriptions, or other communications to

Advanced Thought Publishing Co.

166 N. Michigan Avenue

Chicago, Illinois



KEYNOTE

For
Meditation

FOR APRIL, 1917

I trust in that in which I live, and move and have
my being—that which is in Everything, and in which
Everything is.

*Sound the Mental Keynote. Your thought will
materialize in objective form and action—your
ideal will become real*



ADVANCED THOUGHT

A Monthly Journal of

The New Thought, Practical Psychology,
Yogi Philosophy, Constructive Occultism,
Metaphysical Healing, Etc.

WILLIAM WALKER ATKINSON, Editor

Vol. II.

APRIL, 1917

No. 2

Chips From the Old Block

By William Walker Atkinson

Pessimist, Mock-Optimist, Meliorist-Optimist—which of these are you?

The Pessimist is one who is continually harping on the disagreeable phase of existence. His mental vision, his memory, his imagination and his expectation function on this plane. He dwells in the shadow, and blinks at the sun. The milk of life has become curdled for him—the honey of existence has become spoiled. He looks at the hole instead of the doughnut. When asked to choose between two evils, he chooses both. He is a human wet-blanket; a cold-water thrower; a crape-hanger on the door of life.

The Mock-Optimist is the sickly sentimentalist who denies the most patent facts of life. He trusts to escape the disagreeable phases of life by denying their existence—or by claiming that he "likes 'em." He wanders in the moonlight and calls it high noon. He is so busy with his parrot-like reiterations and phonographic repetitions of "all is good," and "I like it," that he prevents those around him from getting any "good" out of life or from really "liking" the likable. He drives us to the other extreme by nauseating us. "A pessimist is a fellow who has been living among optimists," says someone—and we know just what he means, don't we? The Gladiola Pollyannatinitis is a deceptive plant—its leaves and flowers are beautiful; its perfume is sickeningly sweet; and from its honey is brewed a will-weakening "dope."

The Meliorist-Optimist is the "real thing" in Optimism. He believes that the Good out-measures the Evil—but he recognizes that Evil exists, else how could he measure the Good? He drones not "All is Good," nor yet "All is Evil"; rather does he sing: "Let us look for Good, let us seek the Good, let us expect the Good." He does not deny the Evil, but rather does he affirm: "Things are getting better, things are capable of being made better, let us help to make them better, so far as it lies in our power." These are the folks with the Southern Exposure—these are the "sunny side out" people—these are the individuals who walk on the Sunny Side of the Street.

Be ye, then, neither the Children of the Darkness, nor yet the Children of the Moonshine—but be ye rather the Children of the SUNSHINE.

The Tyranny of Terms

By William Walker Atkinson

The creations of men often grow so strong and ambitious that they master their creators. The Romans raised Julius Cæsar up to a high place, and Cæsar became so strong and ambitious that he sought to make slaves of those who had raised him up. Napoleon Bonaparte was found useful to the French people, and was elevated to the position of First Consul of the Republic; then he grasped the reins of power and made himself Emperor, and brought the nation under the yoke. Do you remember the old story of "Frankenstein," in which the scientist created an artificial man—and later found that the monstrous thing became his master?

In the same way men have created systems of government, systems of business administration, systems of instruction—organizations, institutions, corporations—only to later discover that their creations have grown so strong and powerful that they, in turn, have become the masters, while the original creators have become the servants or slaves. Men often build up great businesses, and "run" them for many years; in the end the created thing turns the tables and "runs" the man, binding him tightly with the chains of habit, ambition, or necessity. There is no human tyranny more oppressive than this tyranny of inanimate things exercised over their creators.

In the same way, men have created certain terms for use in expressing their ideas and thought; and after a time have found that the terms manifest a disposition to hold their creators to certain rigid limits; to put fences around them and wall them in; to make the men their slaves instead of their masters. A study of the history of human thought brings to light many striking instances of this paradoxical truth.

The Case of Freethought

For example, consider the term "**Freethought**." This term was originally employed to indicate and designate the general mental attitude and trend of thought of a class of individuals who called themselves "freethinkers," and whose general philosophical position may be expressed as follows: "**The assertion of the right to form religious opinions, and spiritual conceptions, independent of theological dogma or ecclesiastical authority; and apart from the acceptance of so-called 'revelations' of Deity to certain members of the race.**"

The term was generally used, several centuries ago, by a body of earnest thinkers who believed in a Supreme Being, but who could not accept the popular theology of the Church, particularly the dogmas re-

garding the Virgin Birth, the Trinity, the Godhood of Jesus Christ, etc.—in short, those who held what is known as the Unitarian belief, or at least one phase of that belief. The term was later also used by a still larger body of thinkers who were known as "Deists," whose principles are stated as follows in a popular work of reference: "**Those who admit the being of a God, but deny the existence or even necessity of a divine revelation, believing that the light of reason and nature are sufficient guides in doctrine and in practice; believers in Natural Religion; those who disbelieve in revelation, however, not occupying the Atheistic standpoint, but accepting as a settled point the being of a God.**"

In either or both of the above stated cases the term was used to indicate freedom and independence in religious thought and belief, always with the express or implied belief in the existence of a Supreme Being (for religious thought and belief without the acknowledgment of the Supreme Being is paradoxical). But what do we find today? Simply this: that the term has been taken over and monopolized by one element of non-orthodox thought regarding religion, and has been given such a rigid and definite usage that all other non-orthodox elements have been practically debarred from employing it. **The materialistic atheists (using both of these terms in their true sense) have monopolized the good old term, and have identified it with their own beliefs.**

So, you see, here is a term which originally had the meaning above stated, but which now is used to indicate **anti-religious and atheistic thought**. "**Freethought**," no longer means **free and independent religious thought**, but, on the contrary, **anti-religious thought**. There is no longer any **religious freedom** in it—it is limited and bound to the cause of **anti-religious propaganda, and atheistic theories**.

Strictly speaking, the Unitarians, and many other bodies of religious people; as well as many unattached persons who have deep religious convictions and spiritual faith; are "**freethinkers**." A large portion of New Thought people are "**freethinkers**" **in this sense**. But in the actual present limitation of the term, none of such persons can claim the title—and they do not want to do so, for the reasons stated. This is not alone the result of the bigotry of the orthodox religionists and ecclesiastics, who dub as "**infidel**" and "**atheistic**" all who will not accept their theology, authority and forms. It is equally the result of the materialistic, atheistic faction itself, for the members thereof are very quick to "**call down**" any person who speaks of himself as a "**freethinker**," and who at the same time expresses any shade of positive religious belief. "**Freethought**" today is practically synonymous with "**atheistic materialism**," and "**anti-religion**."

I am merely using the case of the term "**Freethought**" to illustrate a general principle—I am not seeking to change the general interpre-

tation of the term. It is nothing to me, although I sometimes regret the loss of what should be a very noble and dignified term, denoting an advanced and liberal school of religious and spiritual thought. I would be proud to assume the title of "Freethinker" in its original sense, but the term and title have lost their original sense, and now mean something entirely different. I could not consistently use the term now, as applied to myself, for I am not a "Freethinker" in the accepted usage of the term. And yet, thank God, I am now, and trust I shall always be, a "Freethinker" in the sense of: **"One who asserts his right to form religious opinions, and spiritual conceptions, independent of theological dogma or ecclesiastical authority; and apart from the acceptance of so-called 'revelations' of Deity to certain members of the race."** But the term is taboo to me, because of the tyranny which it has set up for itself. Isn't it a pity and a shame that such a noble word as "Freethought" (free religious thought—religious thought that is free) should be so prostituted? We keep on thinking freely and independently about religion—yet we are estopped from employing the term indicating this fact, unless we are willing to bow our necks to the yoke of the present tyranny of the term!

The Case of New Thought

All this preliminary talk, friends, is for the purpose of indicating and explaining what I mean when I say that **NEW THOUGHT** is beginning to assert precisely this same kind of tyranny over its creators. "The new thought" (the term) was first used by the early Unitarians who sought thereby to indicate their conception of Freethought (in its rightful sense). They spoke of "the new thought," meaning thereby the newer conceptions of truth which had come to them—the thought of the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man—the truth of freedom of thought and judgment, in place of the old thought of obedience to ecclesiastical authority, creeds, and dogmas. And, later the Transcendentalists—Emerson and his noble crew—frequently used the term "the new thought."

Later the movement which evolved from the line of Emersonianism on the one hand; and the Mind Cure, on the other hand; assumed the title of "New Thought" (using capital letters this time). And the use of the term rapidly grew in favor among individuals who possessed the independent and free mental attitude; and particularly among those who were attracted by the "mental healing" phases of the general movement. But at no time until very recently was the term employed other than in the most general way. On the one hand the Divine Scientists, and the Independent Christian Scientists, used the term freely as indicating a common bond of thought and aims; on the other hand, the Mental Scientists felt equally free to employ the term

in the same way, for it was so fluid and so non-rigid that nobody felt bound or limited by the employment of the term.

But there has always been a disposition among certain elements of the New Thought, however, to **organize** the movement into a more rigid and formal body—to make an “institution” of it. The attempt was made over and over again—and always failed, glory be! There seemed to be something in the spirit of New Thought which **refused to be organized and made into an institution**. The present International New Thought Alliance rose from the ashes of the dead organizations, or attempts at organizations. It started out to avoid the rocks which had wrecked its predecessors. Its spirit seemed to be that of freedom, independence, and lack of dogma or narrow creeds. And I think that those at the head of the Alliance still hold to these ideals, although they seem to have yielded to the temptation to “organize” more rigidly—to take the first steps toward institutionalism. But I fear that in spite of themselves they will be affected and influenced by the unmistakable tendency on the part of a certain active element in the movement to force New Thought into a closer and more narrowly defined field; and to erect a strong fence around the movement, though they may prefer to call the fence “boundary lines.” **The term “New Thought” is being given a restricted and limited meaning.** This is the first step toward the tyranny of the term.

Don't Define New Thought

I don't like this threatened tyranny of the term. I don't like this yielding to the demand to “define” New Thought in fixed, rigid, limited terms. I don't like this demand for a **Set of Principles**—a formal statement of Dogma or Creed, for that is what it is, though disguised. I glory in the expression of Emerson who when once asked to define the Principles of his philosophy, said: “I trust that the time may never come when I find it necessary to **define** my philosophy” (or words to that effect). I glory in the independence of Bernard Shaw, who when a pompous Bishop once demanded of him that he “state his principles,” replied: “Principles, man? why I haven't any—I make 'em up as I go along!” That is the spirit of the original New Thought—that is the spirit of the real New Thought—no matter what the organized or institutionalized New Thought may say to the contrary.

True New Thought is freedom and independence of thought. It is not formal or authoritative expressions of thought. It is fluidic, flowing, moving, changing in its ideas and manifestations—not fixed, rigid, crystalized, static, stable. It is like a flowing stream—not like a stagnant pool. Like Life itself, it is in a flux, ever-changing, ever-moving, ever-becoming something different. That is where it's “newness” comes in—because it is continually renewing itself, and changing

its forms of expression. But the "official" New Thought that is rapidly organizing itself into an institution is just the reverse of this. Its ideas are toward rigidity, fixity, stability, firmness, formalism.

The New Thought is yielding to this tendency within itself. It has incorporated itself. It has a committee preparing a **Statement of Principles** to be adopted at the next Congress; and in other ways it is moving steadily and rapidly forward on the road of Institutionalism. When it gets there, it will be no longer new thought, but quite old thought. But (and here, and here only, is where it hurts me) notwithstanding the fact that it will have lost its original spirit and essence, it will have appropriated and made its own the term "**New Thought**," and will make use of it exactly as if it had originally made a trademark of the term. And the rest of us will either have to "accept" or "get out." Unless we "sit in," we are no longer "New Thinkers." Oh, don't laugh—that is what's coming, take my word for it. And it's coming fast!

This idea of institutionalizing New Thought is awfully funny when one comes to think of it. It is akin to putting a fence around Infinity. All that can be done is to fence off a portion, and put up the sign: "**THIS is New Thought! The Simon Pure Article! None Sold Outside the Enclosure! Beware of Imitations!**" Shelton says in his March "Scientific Christian":

"Edgerton and Dresser are going to write
A History of New Thought!
Put the River of Life into a bottle!
And the Breath of God into a balloon!

"Go to it, James and Horatio, go to it!
But let old Doctor Quimby rest in peace.
And let Mrs. Eddy repose in her glory.
They are not the authors of New Thought!

"Write a history of God!
For it was God who did it!
It was Satan who inspired it.
It ought to be easy to put into a book!"

This brings to my mind a clever bit of satirical verse which some unknown writer "pulled off" several years ago about New Thought. It was intended as a joke, of course; but there is lots of truth in it, nevertheless—and the kind of truth that I am proud to say is a fact of New Thought. Here it is—laugh over it, and with it; and then let its magnificent meaning sink into your understanding:

"NEW THOUGHT"

"Take a page of Epictetus and a Plato paragraph;
Shake it briskly 'till the mixture makes the gentle scoffers chaff.
Add a slight Socratic flavor, not in excess of a dram,
And a weak solution formed of Persian epigram.

Mix a bit from old Confucius and from Buddha several drops,
 Add Egyptian lore found in the pyramid of great Cheops.
 Now some truths not half remembered and some others half forgot,
 Boil the mixture, boil it briskly, 'till it simmers in the pot;
 And—Lord bless you now, my brother, and the skeptics all beshrew—
 Can't you see that you're approaching the Thought that's labelled 'New?'

'It is Thought,' I said with reverence, much of which is very true,
 'But, if I do not displease you, what in thunder makes it NEW?'
 Came the answer, 'Lo! poor skeptic, hear the truth and doubt no more;
 Such a mixture's mixful mixture never has ben mixed before.'

The New "Statement of Principles"

Imagine institutionalizing this composite conception—this ever-flowing stream of thought. Imagine formulating a "Statement of Principles" sufficiently broad to include all this in it. How the gods on high Olympus must hold their sides while they shake in deific laughter over such an attempt! The New Thought narrowly escaped this folly in San Francisco, in 1915, when several important leaders tried to formulate a Statement of Principles which (if I understand it correctly) would have been but little more or less than a Creed—and made up of a re-hash of orthodox theology in a new phrasing. Some disagreed, and finally old Henry Harrison Brown licked into shape the following "Purpose of the I. N. T. A.," which was included in the Constitution of the Alliance:

"The Purpose of this Alliance shall be to teach the Infinitude of the Supreme One, the Divinity of Man and his Infinite Possibilities, through the creative power of Constructive Thinking and in obedience to the edicts of the Indwelling Presence which is our source of Inspiration, Power, Health, and Prosperity."

That is a good enough "Statement of Principles" for me, and I should very much dislike to see it replaced by some formal, set Creed or Dogma masquerading under the guise of "Statement of Principles." **The closer we define a thing, the more do we limit it.** The demand for a formal "Statement of Principles of New Thought" is nothing more or less than a demand for a New Thought CREED—and that Creed to be modelled along the old "churchy," ecclesiastical lines. I know this by reason of my information regarding the attempts to form such a Creed (under another name) at San Francisco; and by the character of the suggestions regarding the new "Statement of Principles" of the Alliance (to be passed upon at the next Congress) which are now being discussed in the various New Thought centres.

I do not object to the beliefs embodied in such suggested Statements of Principles. I am, of course, quite well satisfied that those holding them should advocate and bring them forward in their own particular New Thought schools, "churches," and journals—I believe in the

fullest liberty of expression in the New Thought units, of course; in fact I am always ready to fight for this, even when I do not agree with the particular principles taught. But I do object to having these "partial statements" fastened upon the whole New Thought movement in the form of a "Statement of Principles" to which all New Thought people must subscribe, or else be considered outside of the tent.

And, likewise, do I object to any "Statement of Principles" which limits and confines the movement to any one particular system of metaphysics, school of philosophy, or **one general religious system**—even though that metaphysical system, school of philosophy, or general religious system should happen to be the one which I, personally, favor or prefer.

And, finally, I object to any formal implication that New Thought is rigid, fixed, and unchanging in its ideas and principles, its manifestations and expressions. Nothing less than the **WHOLE THING** is big enough, and broad enough, for New Thought. And the **real** New Thought is always Alive, and Evolving, and Growing—is constantly Changing in its manifestations and expressions. New Thought is a Living Idea—not a dead and mummified "institution" or "organization."

New Thought Not a Church

I am not alone in this idea, of course—though I happen to be laying special stress upon it at this particular moment. Listen to what Elizabeth Towne says in her February "Nautilus":

"The real (New Thought) movement includes also a great many people who work in the orthodox churches, teaching New Thought in the Sunday Schools, without calling it by that name. And this, too, is according to the teachings of New Thought; we do not bid you come out of the churches and join us, and look down upon your former church friends as benighted babes. We say to you: Try the spirits of New Thought if they be true, and hold fast to that which is good, which will make you a better Methodist, a better Baptist, a better Episcopalian, a better Catholic, a better human being in church, in home, in business, in your municipality, in your state, in the world at large."

This is the right idea. But Elizabeth does not go far enough. She stops short of the ideal. Why does she not carry the idea still further, and say: "which will make you a better Jew, a better Buddhist, a better Brahmanist, a better Taoist, a better Parsee, a better Moham-medan, a better Confucian?"

Would any one dare to say that a **Jew** cannot be a good New Thoughter and still remain a member of his synagogue? Why even the Christian Scientists number many good Jews among their members! **And, if a good Jew, why not a good religionist of the other great religious systems above mentioned?** Is New Thought to be limited to

members of the orthodox Christian Creed? Can't a Jew or a Unitarian be just as good a New Thoughter as a Presbyterian, or a Close-Communion Baptist? Is there anything to keep even a Mormon out of New Thought? (I know some good Mormons who are already in it, by the way!)

If I am wrong in this, please set me straight, you who claim "authority" in the movement. We should come out clearly in the matter, and not dodge the issue. If New Thought is to be **exclusively** orthodox Christian; all right, let us come out and say so. But if it is not (and according to its Constitution it **is not** at this time) then let us beware of making it appear otherwise in any "Statement of Principles" which the Alliance should adopt—if indeed it makes any change at all.

The present statement of "Purposes" says that "**The purposes of this organization are to teach the Infinitude of the Supreme One, etc.**" No one can object to that. **Under this broad tent all believers in the Supreme Being can find shelter**; no matter whether they call that Supreme Being by the name of Jehovah, the name of Brahman, the name of Allah, the name of the Trinity, the name of The Unknowable One, the name of the Infinite and Eternal Light, the name of the Eternal Law, the name of the World-Soul, or the name of "The Infinite and Eternal Power from which all things proceed." **If this be the true New Thought ideal and conception, then let us beware of denying it, stultifying it, by the formulation of new "Statements of Principles" which indicate a limitation of restriction thereof.**

Tie Your Little Church Outside

Shelton has the right idea. In his March "Scientific Christian," he says, commenting upon Elizabeth's paragraph above quoted:

"This is all true, but it shows that New Thought is not an institution or an organization, but an influence. In other words, New Thought is Thought, and Thought is always free to anyone who wants to Think. * * * All of these institutions are old thought, and we want to keep churchitis out of the New Thought movement, or it will cease to be New Thought and become a chronic thought in the old vibrations. Can't you see that this is the truth?

* * * In the New Thought let all who come leave their 'churches' in the cloak room. * * * Why should the individual, as soon as personality begins to develop, want to be the hub with all other individuals as spokes in the wheel. It is not New Thought. Let the Catholic and the Jew, let the Baptist and the Methodist, have all of the New Thought they can absorb, but let them check their private religions in the cloak room."

That's the idea! Let the individual hang on to whatever form of religion suits him the best for the time being (until he sees the Whole Thing under and back of **all** religions) but let him not drag it into New Thought and attempt to embody it in "Statements of Principles"

—instead, “let him check his private religion in the cloak room,” as Shelton says. And this applies equally well—perhaps even with greater emphasis—to those in the New Thought who have invented, instituted, or “founded” New Thought Religions, or New Thought Churches, of their own.

The Institutional Submarine

This may be rather plain talk—rather strong talk—my friends in the New Thought; but it is the kind of thought which is needed just now, in my judgment. There is a stronger tendency than you realize in the direction against which I am warning you. **I know what is going on under the surface.** I am aware of certain instances of “wire pulling” (and “chestnut pulling”) of which even the officers of the Alliance may be unaware. Those behind this phase of the movement are planning to try to “steer” the present administration of the Alliance, or else to vote their own people into office in the coming Congress, or the next one thereafter. Names are already being mentioned for the important positions in the Alliance, in case things cannot be arranged otherwise. I am not an alarmist—I am quite conservative, in view of what I have been given to understand is under way in the movement. Keep an eye on things, and you will see for yourself! That which is now under the surface, will shortly stick its periscope up into the daylight! Its torpedoes are ready to use!

But, at the worst, while they may be able to institutionalize New Thought, and turn us dissenters into “outsiders”—they cannot get us out of the game altogether. At the worst, we can cut out the “New” from the tyrannical term, and still have “**THOUGHT**” left—and they can’t freeze us out of that, can they? For, as Shelton says: “**New Thought is THOUGHT, and THOUGHT is always free to anyone who wants to Think!**” So, if “New Thought” follows the course of “Free-thought,” we can always cut out the qualifying word and assert the magnificent term “**THOUGHT**” without infringing the trade-mark of the institution.

ECCLESIASTICAL SIGNPOSTS

A preacher was once travelling through Scotland. His Scotch driver had a sense of humor and a lack of reverence for parsons. As they passed a fine new guidepost, the driver said: “That’s like our meenister!” “How so?” quoth the parson. “Weel, it telleth, but goeth not!” A little later on they passed an old guidepost, upon which the words were illegible. “That’s like our beeshop!” said the driver. “Why?” asked the parson. “Well, it goeth not, neither doth it tell,” said the driver.

Numerology

Its Appeal to Intuition and Intellect

By Clifford W. Cheasley

The student along occult and metaphysical lines is naturally familiar with the attempts of philosophers of all ages to connect numbers and words with the purpose of revealing the esoteric meaning of the latter by the exoteric demonstration of the former.

A history of such attempts would not be a new departure in literary effort, but it is interesting to note that there does seem to be somewhere in the many expressions of this theory, the grain of truth which has kept it alive in varying degrees of intensity through all the discarding and reconstructing which has gone on in the religious education of the world since eight centuries before Jesus.

In this United States, especially during the creative period of time which began with the year 1900, remnants of the esoteric wisdom back of cold mathematics has become again one of the principal "side lines" of metaphysical centers, teachers and students.

In some directions it has been rejected by reason of the superficial interpretation of its advocates, in others it has been confined to narrow channels by the personal attitude of its teachers who have mistaken universal truth for personal discovery. Some presentations have appealed to the intellect of the student by the manipulation of numbers in proof of the mathematical exactness of life, while other systems have appealed solely to the intuition by a revelation of the illimitable wisdom to which numbers were the keys; only a few of these presentations have succeeded in developing into a science of numbers that has an immediate appeal to the intuition and intellect at the same time by the combination of esoteric wisdom with sane, sensible, practical exoteric life.

The science of Numerology aims to teach the most universal and therefore the best and purest truths extracted from all the "ologies" of numbers which are actively before the world. The forgotten systems it respects for their antiquity, while it regards them as probably useless in methods which advanced thought of today has outgrown.

It is taking stronger hold daily on the race mind because of its usefulness to the modern truth seeker who differs from his earlier brother in that he demands an interpretation from his teachers which can not only inspire by its glorious vision, but can demonstrate its ever-present help in time of trouble which occurs in relation with his human affairs.

As paint makes possible to the artist the portrayal of ideas and visions, so can numbers act as the revealers of fundamental truth on all planes, and translate into facts the thoughts and beliefs which our intuition ofttimes but imperfectly receives.

The philosophy of Numerology is the conception of One Force operating through life on all planes; its demonstration is the explanation of the many diversified interpretations of this one force through individuals, objects and circumstances. It accepts the responsibility of analyzing the character of the Universe itself just as readily as the revelation of an individual, for every man is but a small world in a larger one and science to be completely useful must be universal enough to have no limitation on any side.

All life is vibrating, and evolution from one plane to another is eternal. Material science will admit that the velocity of their atoms is the reason for the stability and endurance of material objects. Therefore if we can extend this same law with the understanding that in lifetime there is no place for death, we can see how in etheric vibration the quality of our characters, our experiences, our environment can be just as easily revealed.

In material life names are used for identification and dates for recording appearance or reappearance, and in the terms of number vibration the name of individual or object is the key to the identification of its qualities, and dates record the circumstances or the appearance of unlimited universal force as human manifestation.

A study of the esoteric side of life convinces us that the reason for life is experience, but that happiness is obtainable through the possession of wisdom acquainting us with the character of experience—as we meet it.

More than half the world lives unconsciously, therefore fearfully and unhappily; but this is not because of any divine force which would have it so. It is simply the result of entire ignorance of the laws of life, and non-acceptance of the truth.

Expression of life on all planes is an evidence of the finest mathematical precision, and "accident" and "misfortune" are terms coined by humans to excuse that which their intelligence cannot explain.

This is the appeal of Numerology and in subsequent articles the deepest philosophy will appear hand in hand with the law of mathematics, to reveal the nature and the purpose of the divine urge working in atmosphere, in circumstance, in object and in man.

"A Fault-Mender is better than a Fault-Finder."

More About Mind-Reading

By Theron Q. Dumont

I shall here continue my talk about Mind-Reading, which I began in my article in the March number of this magazine. Those who are interested in the subject should re-read my first article before reading the present one, in order that the continuity may be preserved.

In developing the power of Mind-Reading, and in attaining proficiency in and the "knack" of finding things under the silent mental guidance of the Projector, it will be well for the Finder to carefully practice and experiment, beginning with the more simple experiments and then proceeding to the more difficult. Persons who wish to develop themselves as Projectors will do well to follow a like course. Practice makes perfect, and it is always scientific to proceed from the simple to the complex. I always instruct my students to undertake the experiments in the following order:

(1) **Finding Locations.** When the Finder has attained proficiency in interpreting the mental messages of **general direction** (as explained in my first article), he should have the Projector mentally direct him to find certain more special locations, such as the corners of the room, the windows, the doors, alcoves, etc. Do not feel that you are fit to pass to the next order of experiments until you are able to find easily any and every location of this kind. When you can do this without effort, and almost automatically, you will be well on the way to greater successes, for this simple principle forms a part of all the more complex experiments.

(2) **Finding Large Objects.** Then proceed to receive and interpret the mental messages concerning the large objects in the room, as for instance, the tables, chairs, book-cases, etc. You should not feel prepared to undertake more difficult experiments until you are able to easily, and almost automatically, "find" any or every piece of furniture in the room. Do not become wearied by the sameness of the experiments, but make yourself proficient in this stage, for by doing so you will greatly simplify your work in the higher experiments, for the majority of small objects which you will be called upon to "find" in the latter will be hidden, around or about the articles of furniture. If there are rugs in the room, include these in your lists of "findable" things.

(3) **Finding Small Objects.** Then proceed to "find" the small articles in the room in the same way. Before you are qualified to pass out of this particular class you should be able to "find" with

ease and rapidity each and every loose book, vase, article of bric-a-brac, etc., in the room. I should advise you to remain in this class even longer than at first would seem necessary; for every hour of work you put in here will tell with effect in the higher work.

(4) **Finding Hidden Objects.** Then you will be qualified and prepared to "find" small articles, such as pen-knives, pocket-books, articles of jewelry, etc., which may be hidden about the room, usually under some larger thing. Have your Projector test you with keys or penknives hidden under small rugs, the corner of a large rug, back of pictures, letters or cards hidden between the leaves of a book, objects placed in someone's pocket, etc. Let him strive to think up or invent unusual arrangements of this kind; so as to give you the widest range of practice possible. The performance of any particular kind of experiments seems to make a mental path over which you may later travel in similar experiments. (Read what I have said in my first article about the mental commands of "up," "down," "right," "left," "stop, that's right," etc.)

(5) **Complicated Experiments.** You are now ready to undertake the more interesting and more spectacular experiments; but remember that even **the most difficult experiment is merely a combination of the simple ones which you have already mastered.** By learning to master all the simple elements, you have learned to master the complex experiment which is built up of them. Here follows briefly a description of a few striking experiments which you will have no trouble in duplicating once you have learned the simple elements composing them.

(a) **The Gift of Flowers.** In this experiment you "find" a bouquet or single flower (previously selected by the company), and then you find the young lady (likewise so selected) and then present her with the flower. By dressing up and elaborating this experiment you will produce a very pleasing bit of entertainment.

(b) **The Reunited Lovers.** In this experiment the company select a young man and a young woman (if they are lovers—or "would be" lovers—there is additional interest created), the two are seated in different parts of the room. You then "find" the young man, and then lead him to the young lady whom you "find" in the usual way. If the right persons are selected, this experiment causes a good laugh.

(c) **Restoring the Lost Jewelry.** In this experiment a piece of jewelry is taken by the company from one of its number, and then hidden away. You find the hidden article and then restore it to its rightful owner whom you "find" in the usual way. This, though very simple, is a very interesting and striking experiment. It may be made more complicated by having some one pretend to steal the jewel, and

then hide it. Here you "find" the jewel, then the owner to whom you then restore it, and finally the "thief" whom you deliver to justice.

(d) **The Mental Detective.** This is really a variation of the last named experiment. In it a mock murder is enacted; one of the company is the criminal, another the victim, a paper knife or piece of twisted paper representing the dagger. You play the part of the "mental detective." You enter, find the "corse"; then you find the hidden dagger in some other part of the room; then you find the criminal whom you hand over to justice. A very startling and sensational experiment when properly performed.

(e) **Returning the Hats.** The hats of the men in the company are placed in a pile; and you take them one by one and place them on the heads of their rightful owners. (It is necessary, of course, that the Projector should know positively to whom each hat belongs, as otherwise he cannot send you the right mental message.) You pick up any hat at random, and then "find" the owner in the usual way. Quite simple; but apparently quite the reverse.

(f) **The Returned Ring.** Much like the above. Here the Projector borrows a ring from one of the ladies present, taking it from her finger (and remembering the finger); then you take the ring and after "finding" the lady you place it upon the right finger. Very simple, yet apparently quite difficult.

In all of the above named experiments the general principle is the same. The entire list is simply a series of arrangements of certain general simple principles. Hence my insistence that you first master the simple principles and experiments, before attempting the more difficult ones. Always perfect yourself in private, before attempting public experiments.

Do not undertake too many experiments during the same evening. A few experiments are entertaining, and interesting; but they soon grow monotonous and tiresome. Better save your experiments for another evening, thereby keeping up an interest in the subject.

Do not overwork yourself, and thus produce exhaustion. The sustained attention and concentration necessary in this work is quite fatiguing; but the tired feeling is soon thrown off by means of placing your attention upon other things.

Have patience, and do not try to progress too rapidly. Master each step before passing on to the next.

(In my next article I shall tell you how to perform some of the more difficult and complicated experiments of the professional performers.)

You are Greater than you know!

Why Was the World Created?

Yogi Ramacharaka

I am frequently requested to answer a question which may be stated as follows: **"Why did God create the World?"** Considering that this question has perplexed the philosophic mind of the race since the beginning of philosophic thought; and that the wisest of the race have regarded it as unanswerable, it is quite a compliment to me that so many thoughtful people have asked me the question in a way that implied that I am competent to and capable of answering it.

I am sorry, however, to be compelled to disappoint my trusting readers by answering rather forcibly: **"I do not know the answer."** But I know **why** I do not know it, and **why** I **can not** know it—I have **nothing to know it with**, for my intellect has been built to handle relative and finite things, not the facts of Infinite and Absolute Being.

And, so far as I know, the intellect of the race in general is built upon the same plan as is mine. There are better trained and more capable intellects than mine, of course, but I believe that even the best developed and trained intellect is limited by certain facts of its nature, which facts restrict its operations to a comparatively narrow field—the question under consideration being clearly outside of that narrow field.

Inasmuch as the "why" of creation—the "meaning" or "wherefore" of this activity of the Creative Power—is a fact of the essential being of that Power, it seems to me that before we can know this "why," this "reason," this "welfare" of Creation, we must know the "what" of the essential being of the Creator—and **that** clearly transcends the power, scope and field of our intellect and of our imagination as well. Even Intuition in its highest activities throws no light on the subject—at least none of which I am aware.

But it may be interesting for us briefly to consider just what men have thought in their speculations upon this subject—just what their philosophical, metaphysical and theological "guesses" on the subject have been. And so I shall here present these attempts to "answer the unanswerable" question.

The Conative Principle of Being

While the general philosophic thought of the race, in its highest presentations, has inclined to the conception of an **Absolute Principle of Being, Perfect and Complete in Itself** (as we shall see presently), there have also always been certain thinkers who have conceived of a **Conative Principle of Being**, i. e., a striving, working, attempting, long-

ing, desiring, endeavoring, acting Principle, filled with the inner urge to express and manifest itself in outward forms, phases and conditions of existence. To such a Principle the "why," "reason," and "wherefore" of Creation would, of, course, be simply that of the **inherent desire to Manifest Outward Existence**—the Will-to-Live, as Schopenhauer called it. The difficulties in the way of the hypothesis of the Absolute Principle are mostly absent from this opposing hypothesis, as we shall see presently when we consider the former.

This hypothesis of the Conative Principle was held by Heraclitus, the Greek philosopher who lived about 600 B. C. It was advanced in a somewhat different form by Schopenhauer, the German philosopher of the last century, and has been recently put forward in a still different form by Bergson, the modern Belgian philosopher, in his philosophy of "Creative Evolution," in which the Conative Principle is called "Life"—its creation being held to be caused by the desire and striving of "Life" to live in outward form and expression. Wundt, and other German philosophers, have also conceived of a Conative Principle of Being, which is described as "a spiritual creative activity; a striving, feeling, sensing, like that which we experience in ourselves."

The essence of any conception of a Conative Principle is, of course, **the Desire to Act**. A modern writer has expressed such a Principle as: "**A Power with the Desire to Act, or a Desire with the Power to Act.**" This last statement implies simply a **Will-Principle**, inasmuch as Will in its two phases is (a) Desire, and (b) Action, respectively. Buddhism is often held to postulate this Universal Will-Principle as the Reality, or Supreme Being—but a closer inquiry shows that it considers the Universal Will-to-Live as merely a **manifestation or expression** of an Underlying Reality which is Unknowable and Beyond Thought.

This class of hypothesis has been favored by certain schools of philosophy for the reason that it seemed to furnish a clearer and simpler answer to the question of the "why," "reason," and "wherefore" of the created world, while at the same time its Principle is held to be no more difficult to account for than is the Absolute Principle of the opposing school. The objection to it, advanced by the opposing schools, is that this conception lessens the dignity and grandeur of the Principle of Being, holding, as it does, that this Principle finds it necessary to struggle, strive, endeavor and work for all Eternity to manifest and express objective life for itself—yet never really attaining anything, or actually "getting anywhere," and being always apparently under some compelling Law of its own essential being.

The Absolute Principle of Being

The schools of thought which postulate the existence of an **Absolute Principle of Being**, approach to the answer of our question: "Why did

God create the World," from an entirely different position. In fact, perhaps the most advanced and subtle reasoners of this school refuse to consider the question at all, stamping it as illogical and fallacious on its very face. Their reasons for this position are as follows: (1) The basic postulate of the existence of an Absolute Principle of Being carries with it the implication that such Principle must be absolutely free, independent, unconditioned, beyond cause, or motive, or influence outside of itself, and free from compelling motives, laws or influences within itself; that it must be omniscient and omnipotent, i. e., must have perfect wisdom and infinite knowledge as well as absolutely free will and power to act; that it must be complete and perfect, and lacking in nothing which could add to its perfection or completeness of being. (2) this being admitted, it is seen that any assumption of a necessary "why," "reason" or "wherefore" impelling the Absolute Principle to the activity of the creation of the World is practically attributing a necessary "cause," "motive," or "influence" (external or internal to itself) to that which must be free from such attributes by reason of being Absolute—this in short is akin to asking "what causes or influences the action of that which is beyond causes, influences, or motives to action." (3) therefore, the question is seen to be illogical, fallacious, self-contradictory, paradoxical, and without real meaning or validity.

Such philosophers while refusing to "answer" the question for the reason just given, sometimes venture an "explanation" to meet the difficulty along lines something like this: "The Absolute Principle simply wills to create, not as the result of any desire, motive, influence, reason, of end to be gained, but simply as an act of pure free will, without cause, reason, of motive as we understand these terms." But as we can understand Will only as responding to desires, motives, influences, reasons and ideas, the "explanation" does not "explain" much to our intellects. It simply elevates the activity to a plane of being into which our thought cannot follow it. So this "explanation" is not far removed from the above-stated "refusal to answer the illogical question," is it?

This school of philosophy also strives to show the illogical nature of the would-be answers of other schools to this question, which answers seem to indicate that the Absolute Principle seeks to "gain," "acquire," or "secure" something which seems desirable to it and which it previously "lacks." The objection to these is: (1) that the Absolute cannot be thought of as possessing desire (i. e., longing for, craving after, earnest wish for, something that it lacks), for such would be an impelling cause, influence or motive to action, which is unthinkable of the Absolute; and (2) that as the Absolute is and must be perfect and complete, and "lacking nothing" which could add to its perfection and completeness, then the assertion of "desire for that

which is lacking" is unthinkable of the Absolute. Moreover, it is added, as there is **nothing outside** of the Absolute which it could desire to acquire (there being no "outside"), then all that it could **desire or lack** (even if such were otherwise possible) would be **that which is already within itself**—which idea is illogical and absurd.

This school also objects to another answer which is sometimes made, i. e., the hypothesis that the Absolute creates **in order to become conscious**, as consciousness depends upon **objects of consciousness**, and these are lacking unless it creates them. The answer is that this idea of consciousness is merely that of **finite consciousness**, not **infinite consciousness**; finite consciousness depends not only upon objects of consciousness, but also upon the concentration of attention upon particular objects; whereas infinite consciousness is above such limitations, and may be considered really rather as super-consciousness than as ordinary consciousness. Moreover, the Absolute being **omniscient**, all-wise, all-knowing, cannot well be thought of as ever being **unconscious**, or lacking in full consciousness. Finally (even ignoring the other objections), how could that which was **unconscious** happen at the same time to be **conscious** of what it lacked, and also **know how** to proceed. The hypothesis is discarded as lacking in logical validity and real meaning.

The Answers of Theology

But theologians rush in where philosophers fear to tread. We find in all lands and in all religions, theologians boldly and positively answering (!) these questions which the wisest philosophers deem unanswerable. And this is all the more startling because the theologians first assert that their conception of Deity is that of Absolute Being, and then proceed to announce answers and explanations which the philosophers of the Absolute discard as illogical and without meaning or value. Let us take a glance in passing at these different answers advanced by the theologians (orthodox and "heathen" alike, for there is really not much difference between them in the matter of such answers).

You will notice, though, that although these theologians (orthodox or heathen) positively assert that their particular conceptions of Deity postulate the fact of Absolute Being to Deity, nevertheless nearly all of their answers and explanations of the acts of Deity imply that He is but a magnified Man. Their conceptions are **anthropomorphic**—they think of Deity as acting from the same motives, reasons, influences, causes and desires that they, themselves, would possess if they were suddenly elevated to the Throne of Heaven. They ignore the axiom that: **All this which is asserted of the Relative and Finite, must be denied to the Absolute and Infinite**" (and vice versa)—this from the very laws of thought and reason, and by reason of the very meaning

of these respective sets of terms. This fact alone is enough to destroy the value of the "explanations" of the "why and wherefore" of the Divine Activities—but there are other reasons as well why such explanations must be futile and inadequate. Let us take a brief glance at this class of answers, and consider still more briefly some of the most apparent objections to each.

Here are some of the "explanations" or "pious guesses" of the theologians: (1) That the Deity was **lonesome**, and created the World for **companionship**. Imagine a perfect, Infinite and Absolute Being—a Self-Sufficing Being—as being lonesome, and needing companionship!

(2) That the Deity **wished to gain experience or knowledge**, and created the World for the **purpose of experiment and study**. Imagine Omniscience requiring experience or knowledge! Would it not require as much knowledge and experience to **create** a World, as could be gained by **studying it after its creation**?

(3) That the Deity **wished something to love**, and hence created the World **to bring forth living creatures to be loved**. This is too pitifully anthropomorphic to require criticism. It is almost as crude as the conceptions of some of the Hindu sects which hold that Deity craved Love and hence created a Female Deity as a Mate.

(4) That Deity **craved worship and glory**, and created the World and men **in order to be worshipped and glorified**. Clearly the childlike, naive conception of a people accustomed to vainglorious and conceited kings and potentates who desired reverence and glory!

(5) That the Deity **wished to manifest His wisdom and power**, so as to see what He could accomplish in the way of Creation, and therefore created the World as **an illustration and proof of His Omniscience and Omnipotence**. Another conception inspired by the thought of an ambitious potentate! Surely this picture of Deity acting like a child with a new toy is not a worthy conception! And what was Deity doing during all the preceding Infinitude of Eternity? If, as some would claim, the present World is but one of a series of progressive experiments, it would seem that Deity has made but little progress considering the countless aeons which have passed in the past of Eternity, **not to speak of the absurdity of thinking of All-Wisdom and All-Power having to resort to "experiments" in order to create a satisfactory world—having to learn by experience like an apprentice**. If Omniscience and Omnipotence could not have produced a perfect World in an instant, and at one attempt, then it can never hope to do so in the future, for the very doubt denies the fact of All-Knowing and All-Power. And, forget it not, there was as much "**time**" (or possible time) in the past of Eternity as there will be in the future

of Eternity; so that if it is claimed that Deity **needs time** in order to work out perfection, we must reply that, even in that case, He has had already an Infinitude of Time—a beginningless Eternity. In short, reason shows that all such conceptions are in flat contradiction of the Omniscience and Omnipotence, the Absolute Infinity, of Deity! And yet men gravely announce such “explanations!”

(6) That the Deity **desired to be amused**, and so created the World as “**sport**,” “**recreation**,” or “**amusement**”—something in the way of a Cosmic Drama, “which for the pastime of Eternity He doth contrive, enact, behold”; mankind being but “a moving row of Magic Shadow-Shapes that come and go, round with the Sun-illuminated Lantern held in Midnight by the Master of the Show,” as Omar Khayyam puts it. This is a typically Oriental conception, inspired doubtless by the thought of the pleasure-loving potentates and princes of those lands. Even one of the great ancient Vedantists fell into this theological error, and said that it seemed that Brahman must be thought of as acting like a great Prince, and creating the World “for sport” alone, as there could be no other “reason” attributed to the act of a Being who was possessed of everything. The idea is crudely anthropomorphic, of course, and is particularly distasteful to the Occidental mind, except perhaps as a form of poetic expression as in the case of Omar, who possibly merely so intended it.

(7) That the Deity **so loved Man** that he created the World as his dwelling place, and then brought him into being. Outside of the objection of anthropomorphism in this case, one cannot help wondering (with the skeptic) how even Deity could love anything that was not in existence, **not even begun**. And, also, if such were the case, why did not Deity manifest His love more fully, in the direction of making the World a Heaven, in the first place? And Man an Angel?

(8) That the Deity is under the Illusion or Delusion of “**Maya**,” and created the World under the influence thereof. This is another Oriental idea, doubtless inspired by the frequent example of the Potentate or Prince under the influence of hasheesh, or other drug! The idea of a Deity “under the influence” of the Cosmic Drug of Maya, is pitiful—even more pitiful than the Occidental notion of a Deity who “makes mistakes” and “changes His mind” frequently; or of an otherwise mentally incompetent Deity. Surely distorted pictures of an Absolute, Perfect, Omniscient and Omnipotent Being!

Is the World a Dream?

This is about the end of the list. But before closing, let me call your attention to the metaphysical hypothesis (advanced by thinkers Oriental and Occidental), at different stages of the history of metaphysical thought, which holds that the creation of the World is the

result of the **Dream of the Absolute**—that the World is unreal, and simply a mirage or phantasmagoria arising from the “dream” or at least “day dream” of the Infinite One. Of course, in its crude and literal form this conception is clearly anthropomorphic, and must be discarded as such. But it is worthy of note that this idea has been accepted by many of the world’s most profound metaphysicians as being the **SYMBOL** of the true nature of the World in its relation to the **Absolute One**. Viewed as a symbol, it has a philosophical value to the minds of many thinkers on the subject, and is found as the basis of many esoteric schools of thought (although sometimes cleverly disguised).

The Idealistic Conception

That the World is a Mental Creation of the Absolute—a Cosmic Thought-Form in the Infinite Mind—is, of course, the teaching of many important schools of Oriental and Occidental Idealism. But, it must be noted in this connection that even such a high metaphysical conception does not explain the “why,” the “reason,” the “wherefore” of the creation of the World—it merely expresses a hypothesis or teaching regarding the “how” or “what” of the creative processes, that’s all. The question of the “why” and “wherefore” of Creation, still remains unanswered even in this lofty conception.

And, finally, Christian Science (if I understand it aright) holds that the material world was never really created at all! This school seems to hold that the material world is merely the result of “error of mortal mind,” and has no actual existence in Truth. This at first seems to settle the question, if the doctrine is accepted; but alas! the “mortal mind” or intellect of us generally persists in asking: “But how did mortal mind arise—and to whom did the ‘error’ first manifest itself?—and finally, **WHY**, in both instances?”

“HE KNOWS!”

And so, at the last we find ourselves just where we started—asking “Why?” but receiving no answer. But, as old Omar said: “But **HE** knows it all—**HE KNOWS!**” And with that, I, for one, am content—at least for the present.

NO RASH STATEMENTS FOR HIM

It is said of a preacher who had apparently determined not to make “rash statements,” that in speaking to his people on Repentance he had this for his final word: “If you do not repent—as it were; and be converted—in a measure; you will be damned—to a certain extent.”

—ABRAHAM M. RIHBANY.

The Psychology of Woman

By Margaret Van Norden

(Continued from March Number)

Woman, as a rule, is more conservative than is Man. Man is more of an adventurer, willing to take the chance of the unknown seas and strange lands; while Woman instinctively feels inclined to hold on to what she has already secured, fearing to risk it in the venture. These traits arise naturally, according to the laws of evolution. Man has ever been the rover, hunter, explorer, conquerer; while Woman has ever been the one who must "hold together" the things of the home, the family, the communal property. Anything that threatens her sense of security and shelter, naturally arouses her suspicion and opposition. She is the natural balance wheel of Man in this matter.

Some of the primitive peoples always made a point of consulting the old women of the tribe before making any radical or unaccustomed move or change in the tribal affairs. The old rule of the tribe was that Man was supreme in the affairs of the hunt, war or chase, while Woman was supreme in all that concerned the village, the home, the social welfare of the tribe. In many cases the home belongings were the property of the woman, and the children looked to her as the head of the family—the man being the provider of meat. In case of disagreement, the man departed, leaving the woman in possession of the tent and household goods, and in charge of the children.

So we see, that in the affairs of life the mind of Man works best along the lines which have been established during the ages—the affairs of providing the living for the family. Likewise, the mind of Woman works best along the lines which are hers by reason of the experience of the race, namely, those having to do with Love, the Home, Children and Society. Occasionally a woman has to play the part of the man in the world of work—but she never really likes it, and always feels out of her proper sphere. The man who would match wits with a woman about things in her own particular sphere is a fool—he is as an amateur who seeks a match with a champion. Where are keenly concerned or deeply involved the personal interest and feelings of a woman, she will display a subtlety and an almost diabolical ingenuity toward defeating the ends of the man or woman who opposes her.

A very common illusion entertained by men regarding Woman—an illusion, by the way, that is held even by a very celebrated writer on the subject—is that Woman takes but little heed of the future

but lives almost altogether in the present. It is undoubtedly true that very young women take but little heed of the future in love affairs and in marriage. But this is equally true of young men. The failing is not that of sex, but rather of youth. Young people refuse to look the future in the face when the question of love and marriage arises. If they acted otherwise, it is probable that there would be but very few youthful matches made and carried out. Nature throws a veil before the mental vision of young lovers—and that view not only limits their vision regarding the future, but also gives a rose-tinted glow to the present.

When it comes to the older woman in love, on the other hand, it is my opinion that she really takes into consideration the future fully as much, if not more, than does the man in love. She sees many things ahead of them that he overlooks—but she proceeds nevertheless. She takes a chance—a long chance, often—in the affairs of love and marriage, though she is inclined to be conservative regarding other things. Man's failure to perceive this foresight in Woman arises by reason of her particular unconscious philosophy which inclines her to make the best of the present while she has it. This, not by reason of her failure to see into the future, but rather because of her ability to look ahead. Here is one of the many examples of the apparent paradox in Woman's nature.

There is very much of the spirit of "eat, drink and be merry; for tomorrow we die," about Woman—very much more of it than the average man realizes. It will be found even in the woman who seems to possess it the least, if one probes far enough beneath the surface. Though at first somewhat puzzling, a little careful consideration enables us to explain the matter. It will be found that the average woman (past the stage of early youth) **has really discounted nearly everything in the way of adverse circumstances that is likely to ever occur to her**, and much that is not at all likely. Yet, at the same time she manages to live in the present, and to get what she can of pleasure out of it, apparently without a thought of the future. Nearly every married woman has buried her husband, mentally, many a time; has seen herself a widow; and has pictured something of her life afterward. These thoughts cause her much emotional distress, but at the same time they possess a strange fascination for her. Wise observers are of the opinion that Woman usually has discounted practically everything that ever comes to her, long before it comes. But, she keeps her impressions to herself, or at least away from her men relations. It would appall many a married man to realize how completely he had been laid away, buried, mourned for, and survived, in the imagination of his wife. He would be dismayed to perceive that very complete working plans to meet such emergencies had already been prepared

and filed away in the pigeon-holes of his wife's mind. And, yet all the time he has been thinking of her as sadly lacking in foresight, and as living the mental life of a butterfly, satisfied with one day at a time.

It think that this also is an inheritance of the woman from the experience of her fore-mothers—the crystalized experience of a long line of female ancestors. The life of the women of the earlier times—of all times until only a few generations past, in fact—was a precarious one. Their men were engaged in an almost continuous series of wars, and widowhood was the common lot. Woman naturally expected her home life to be broken up by the sudden death of the husband, and the idea became fixed in her mind. She always had the feeling of dread expectation in the background of her consciousness—she always discounted it. It was one of the facts of life, to be taken for granted.

But, at the same time, she learned to extract as much joy as possible from the passing day. She learned to make the best of the present, because she feared the future. This is not an unusual occurrence in human nature. Experience proves that in the long continued presence of danger the human mind reacts toward enjoying the present moment. Soldiers are wont to participate in revelry just before the great battle, if opportunity presents itself. The soldier in the trenches enjoys the practical jokes and lighter amusements of his comrades. It is Nature's means of maintaining a mental and emotional balance. And, so, this inheritance of Woman, representing the continued experiences of fore-mothers, has given her this apparently paradoxical nature. She seems to live only in the present, enjoying the pleasures of the moment, and being attracted by the trifling incidents of the day—yet, at the same time, like the Sphinx she continually peers into the future, seeing not all that is there in store for her, but also much else that never will come to her. No wonder that Man fails to understand her in this respect.

This faculty of Woman to live in the present also gives her the tendency to perceive more clearly the little things that lie right before her. She has an almost uncanny way of perceiving the close, apparently obvious things that Man has overlooked. The woman sees that which is right under her nose, while the man misses just that thing. This is one of the reasons why men consider women "intuitive," while women consider men stupid. Moreover, this habit of seeing the "near" things so plainly and distinctly enables Woman to see those things as they really are, while the vision of Man frequently causes him to surround them with a halo or fringe of false light—his mental eyes lack the proper focus for near things.

Woman does not really have many illusions regarding the things which lie well in her field of mental vision, and in which her feelings are not involved—she cannot understand Man's tendency to endow such things with unreal qualities. She is suspicious of the dressing, padding and adornment of common things, which so often delude Man—she can see the naked form beneath the artifices, for she knows something of artifices herself. She has the mental habit of turning the goods, and looking at them on the wrong side. She looks for the seams and lining, whereas Man looks only at the outside of the garment. Her "shopping" instinct manifests in her view of the near-by things of life.

These and many other similar instances of the mental specialization of Woman, arising from the combined effect of her heredity and her present environment, tend to greatly puzzle Man, who has specialized in other directions in response to his needs and environment and according to the laws of evolution. Man considers Woman "queer," while Woman regards Man as more or less of a fool about many simple things. The Woman's "because" does not (as Man supposes) imply that she has **no reasons at all** for her ideas and decisions, but rather that the matter seems so pitifully simple and elementary to the Woman that she finds it hard to advance logical reasons to account for it. So Man exercises his wits advancing all sorts of complex reasons for Woman's actions and ideas, while the real reason is so simple that he does not perceive it—it lies "right under his nose," but he overlooks it because his gaze is fixed upon things far distant. But Woman does not undeceive Man—she finds that being a mystery adds to her attraction in the eyes of Man; and, then, it serves to conceal her real motives and designs. "It is not a good thing to let the man know everything," is an axiom treasured in the mind of the average woman. And, alas! experience proves the wisdom and truth of the idea—for men really are like big boys in many of the important things of life.

ETERNALITY

"Nothing is created; nothing destroyed; and yet the way of Nature is transformation, unceasing Change. No thing stands still for an instant—not even the granite rock. There is nothing new in the constitution of anything—nothing that did not exist before its incipience, and that will not survive its dissolution. Something cannot be made from Nothing; neither can Something be reduced to Nothing. We can conceive of no time when Nothing was, and Something was not."

The Raw Materials of Mind

By William Walker Atkinson

In my last month's paper I called your attention to the fact that the mental activities known as **sensations** were considered by psychologists as constituting "the raw materials of Mind." This being so, the student of psychology should acquaint himself thoroughly with these "raw materials" of which all the higher mental states are composed and created. In the present paper I shall try to bring out the important facts concerning these "raw materials," at least so far as my limited space permits me so to do.

Sensation is defined as: "An impression, or the consciousness of an impression, made upon the mind, through the medium of a nerve or one of the organs of sense." The term "**sense**" is defined as: "a faculty possessed by animals, of perceiving external objects by means of impressions made upon certain organs of the body, or of perceiving changes in the condition of the body."

The senses constitute "the doors to the outside world," which when opened permit the entrance of messages from that world; but which closed bar the entrance of anything from without. When the doorways are clear and clean, the messages of the outside world enter freely; but when we allow them to be "cluttered up" with rubbish, then the outside things find it difficult to enter; and when we refuse to open the doors at all, then we are shut up within ourselves and all communication with the outside world is absent.

Few of us ever stop to think of how completely we are dependent upon these doors of the senses for our knowledge, experience and subjects of thought. We take it all for granted, and fail to perceive the importance of these senses. Only when one or more of the senses fail us do we begin to realize the importance of the senses and sensation as a whole. And even then we only partially realize the facts of the case, for it is one of the wonderful facts of life that when one sense fails an individual, then one or more of the other senses grow keener and endeavor to accommodate themselves to the situation in the direction of "helping out" the defective sense. (As an example of this, consider the increased sensitiveness of the remaining senses of a blind person.) It is only when we stop to think of how completely shut in, and shut out, we would be if **all** of our senses were destroyed, that we can even begin to realize just how dependent we are upon the senses and sensation for our knowledge, thoughts, feelings and general personal character and life.

Psychologists have pointed out to us the fact that if a human being were born without some organs, or rather how perfect a being he might have, his life would be little more than that of the plant. He would exist in a dreamlike state, with only the faintest consciousness of consciousness. His consciousness would not be able to react in response to the impact of sensations from the outside world, for there would be no such impact. And as consciousness depends almost entirely upon the impact of, or resistance to, outside impressions, his consciousness would be almost entirely inactive. He would be conscious of his own existence, but would probably never realize the full fullness of his own existence, and he would have nothing else with which to compare himself, and his self-consciousness would not be aroused by the presence and pressure of the "not self." Remember, such a man would not even have the memories of previous sensations or experience to arouse or heighten his consciousness or thought and consequently he would have no imagination to use. He would be, to all intents and purposes, a "living corpse."

Helen Keller had only two doors of sensation allowed to her: the sense of sight and the sense of hearing. Touch, taste and smell, however, were left to her, and each was quickened and heightened in order to help as far as possible to perform the work of the defective senses. Her sense of touch, especially, was wonderfully increased and quickened into activity and through this channel her "self" was finally reached and communicated with by living sensations and feelings. The result in this particular case was almost a miracle: yet only two senses were missing. To get the full meaning of the importance of the senses, we have but to think of Helen Keller as having been also robbed of the sense of TOUCH.

Another thought along the same lines is this: The world of the individual is increased by each sense added to him, and decreased by each sense subtracted from him. Try and imagine the limited state of knowledge of the world which would be possible to the individual if he were possessed of merely the elementary sense, i. e., that of TOUCH! How much of the world, as known to us, would be missing to such a man. He would hear no music and see no color or form of things; he would taste nothing and smell nothing. And the sense of HEARING and his world would be multiplied, increased, enlarged, as a wonderful degree. And then add the sense of sight, and realize what an entirely new world would be opened to him! And this is just what has happened to life in the course of organic evolution.

Science informs us that all the senses have been evolved from the elementary sense of TOUCH and that all our senses are but modified and more complex forms of TOUCH. The elementary life forms possessed merely the sense of TOUCH, and that has finally developed—

tact with them, the impulse being conveyed to the nerves, and by them transmitted to the brain. Psychologists tell us that the sensations of taste comprise five classes, viz.: sweet, sour, bitter, salty and "hot" (as pepper, etc.).

Smell. The evolved sense of Smell is manifested by means of delicate nerves terminating in the mucous membrane of the nostrils; the latter registering contact with minute particles of material objects entering the nostrils, and also registering differences in the chemical composition of such particles; the message of the nerve-ends being transmitted to the brain. The particles must actually enter the nostrils and come in contact with these nerve-ends in order to be sensed; mere nearness will not be registered. We "smell" the rose because minute particles of its substance are carried into the nostrils. (Gases are, of course, composed of small particles of matter just as truly as is dust, for instance.)

Hearing. The evolved sense of Hearing is manifested by means of delicate nerves terminating in the inner part of the ear. The eardrum (or "tympanum") vibrates in response to the air-vibrations or "sound waves" reaching it from outside, and intensifies the original vibration; the auditory nerve-ends take up the impression and pass it on to the brain. Sound waves are sensed according to their characteristics of pitch, intensity, quality and harmony, respectively.

Sight. The evolved sense of Sight, which is considered the highest in the scale of the evolved senses, is manifested by a complex organism and nerve-arrangement. The delicate optical nerves terminate in the intricate and complex organism known as the "eye." The retina of the eye is a very sensitive membrane of nerve-matter lining the back of the eye, and being connected with the minute ends of the optic nerve. The mechanism of the outer eye focuses the light waves entering the eye from outside, and conveys the focused vibrations to the retina, from which the impression is conveyed by the nerves to the brain. By the sense of Sight we receive the sensations of the intensity of the light waves, and the color vibrations thereof.

Additional Senses. Modern psychologists have enlarged the old category of the senses, claiming that the old classification is crude and incomplete. For instance, they have added a "muscular sense," closely allied to Touch; the "internal organ sense," and the senses of "thirst," "hunger," "sexual-feeling," etc., etc., which need not be considered at length in this article.

In my next month's paper, I shall invite you to consider the phenomena of Perception.

Premortem Agreements

By Arthur Gould

Thousands upon thousands of persons have agreed before death to send back information if they could. There have been many premortem agreements between two persons, that the one that dies first would as soon as possible after death, furnish some information of spirit life, stating what it was like and giving some genuine evidence of the soul as an immortal being.

One of the foremost investigators of the Psychical Research Society of America agreed with his co-worker, in case he died first to make himself manifest; the other person promising to do the same thing in case he departed first. The messages they were to send each other were reduced to writing. They were then sealed and put away. Neither knew what each other's message was. After the death of one of the men, no communication took place until a medium was called in, a woman who had acted as a clairvoyant to both of them for many years. Through her powers the dead man communicated the message he had agreed to, also telling some things that had happened in the lifetime of the dead man, which were investigated and found to be true. The results seemed so true that the living professor believed that he really had received word from his spirit friend.

Granting that the woman was a genuine clairvoyant, was she not in a position to ascertain the facts even without resorting to tricking? She might have obtained the facts through her subconscious faculty; for to be a clairvoyant her faculties must be developed to a very high degree. On the pages of the mental book there must be an endless number of impressions. Could she not have unearthed after death the facts that were in the brains of those who lived when she knew them?

If the spirit of the dead could manifest himself to the medium, why couldn't it to his friend? Why was it necessary to secure the services of so gifted a medium? Such a communication is not as convincing as we would like it to be. For a gifted medium could, owing to the fact that currents of interest run in grooves, reproduce thoughts and facts of persons after their death, although they would be total strangers to her.

We wish and hope for a certain thing and it comes true. To expect something to take place is helpful to its happening. What this law is we do not know. But can there not be such a law in operation when we receive messages from the apparently dead? They might know nothing of them and could be debarred from the possibility of sending them.

The spirits of the dead might sometimes hold communications with those living on this planet, but there are few cases on record where the evidence seems strong and genuine that they do. Unless you possess an expert mind you can be easily misled and mistaken.

Whether the spirits can come back and communicate with the living is an open question. But there are thousands and thousands of instances of the soul in its flight from the body manifesting itself by vision, and speech also, to those dearest to them. But the time is very limited.

I have a friend that was sitting in her room one morning, and as she looked up from the book she was reading she saw her father and heard him say, "communicate with mother." She felt something serious had happened and made up her mind to take the first train home. For this reason she looked at the clock and knew exactly what time it was. As she could not get a train until the afternoon, she telegraphed to find out if anything had happened. Before her telegraph reached home she received a wire stating her father had been killed. She found out afterwards the father was killed at just about the time he appeared to her. There are thousands of such cases. To deny them would be like denying something we knew was true. From the many cases on record it seems that we are justified in believing that the spirit does, before taking its flight to other worlds appear sometimes to their loved ones. There is no authenticated case of a spirit being on earth longer than fifty hours after death of the body has taken place. There is no doubt that you could collect over one hundred thousand instances of the departing soul having made its passage felt or its form seen shortly after death had taken place. The proofs are so abundant that there seems no room for doubt.

Owing to the unsettled conditions of the world today caused by the great conflict on the other side, more intelligent persons are investigating the belief relative to the future state, than probably ever before.

They start out with the idea that the claims set forth are impossible to know, but if they continue their search, they become convinced that there is a mite of truth in some of the claims, but whether human beings are able to hold communications with the spirits of the dead is hard to prove. But I will review why those who have given much thought to the subject believe they do.

Physical manifestations have taken place that they believed were the exact faces of relatives or friends on the other side.

Dr. J. Maxwell of Bordeaux, France, has produced luminous phenomena that seem to baffle all attempts of explanation except on the theory of there being ethereal bodies.

Prof. Charles Richet has recorded an extraordinary case of materialization that was obtained under open conditions where fraud was seemingly impossible. Sir William Crookes has given personal testimony of physical manifestations. Sir Oliver Lodge has just published a book of messages that are supposed to have come from his son who was killed in the present war.

Hereward Carrington after devoting many years to almost unbroken series of investigations sums up his knowledge in the following statement:

1. He started out in cold skepticism, expecting to find everything psychic to be fraudulent.
2. He now believes thoroughly that some trance manifestations, some clairvoyance, some premonitions, are absolutely proved beyond cavil or doubt of any kind.

He says that it is possible the genuine materialization exists as a fact in future. "There must be some force in the world as yet unknown," is the way he expresses it. He does not say it is spirits.

The dead we know do depart from this earth, and they either leave this earth behind forever, or they come back and pass through another earthly existence. In some future articles I will discuss both phases of the subject. Everyone who really wants to learn the truth, should consider these articles with an open mind, setting aside for the time being all preconceived beliefs and considering the facts just as presented. Let us have the truth will be my motto. Next month's article will be, "The Soul's Flight."

GOOD ADVICE

Don't try to fool yourself. Face facts fearlessly. Try to get at the truth. Demand the evidence. Don't pretend to believe things that you don't believe. You are under no obligations to believe anything until you really do believe it; then believe it with all your mind and all your heart. The product of your thinking should be positive, effective ideas; not chronic scepticism, nor pessimism. When you get into a scrape, don't sneak and crawl—face the music. Be gentle, be just, be kind. But don't imagine that you ought to crush all anger and hatred out of your heart. Anger and hatred must be controlled, not destroyed. Be angry at injustice. Hate cruelty and humbug, and indecency, and ugliness, and uncleanness.

—FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS.

Heart-to-Heart Talks

By the Editor

In this department the editor gathers his readers around him in a family circle and has a little talk with them, informally and "friendly-like," in the good old-fashioned way.

WHERE I STAND

There is no such thing as "standard" or "official" New Thought—as yet.. There is no "official mandate" regarding its teachings—as yet! There is no "official sanction" or "authority" in the New Thought—as yet! I am absolutely opposed to all attempts to fasten these things upon the New Thought movement; and I shall fight against all such attempts, and all the signs thereof, so long as I have a shot left in the locker.

WILLIAM WALKER ATKINSON.

"THE NEW THOUGHT JARLEY'S WAX-WORKS"

Ever hear of "Jarley's Wax-Works?" Well, whether you remember the old thing itself, or not, I wish to call your attention to the "New Thought Jarley's Wax-Works"—21, Count 'Em! They are the funniest thing alive (or dead, or neutral) in the whole New Thought world. Never heard of 'em, you say! Well, here they are—right in the printed list of officers of the International New Thought Alliance; take a good look at 'em:

"HONORARY PRESIDENTS"

William Walker Atkinson.
Henry H. Benson.
Thomas Parker Boyd.
Henry Harrison Brown.
Florence Crawford.
Horatio W. Dresser.
George Wharton James.
Edgar Lucien Larkin.
Christian D. Larson.
Orison Swett Marden.
Edwin Markham.

Annie Rix Militz.
Charles Brodie Patterson.
Charles Edgar Prather.
May Wright Sewall.
T. J. Shelton.
Elizabeth Towne.
William E. Towne.
Ralph Waldo Towne.
Lilian Whiting.
Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

See 'em? Twenty-one—count 'em! Many are well-known (national and international) New Thought teachers, writers and workers—others not so well known outside of their own localities; some of them I have never even heard of outside of the printed list. But all of them—every blessed one of 'em—have been set up like the "wax-figgers" in Mrs. Jarley's Wax-Works Show, to be gazed at, admired, and envied

by the awe-struck New Thought multitude. They have no other purpose—**nothing to do but be ornamental!**

In the Constitution and By-Laws of the Alliance is to be found a list of the various officers to be elected, among which are: "Honorary Presidents of an indefinite number to be selected by the Alliance." In the next paragraph, we find the "Duties of Officers" plainly stated; the President, the Vice-Presidents, the Secretary, the Treasurer, the Auditor—all these have duties well-defined and specific, plainly set forth. But the "Honorary Presidents" have no duties allotted to them—they have apparently nothing to do except to "look pretty," and to "smile for the lady, my dear."

Whenever I look at that list, my sides shake with laughter. Whenever I think of it, I chuckle and chortle in glee. When I gaze upon that Roster of the Immortal Twenty-one—that catalogue of the "Wax-Figgers"—and see there the names of such staunch and sturdy individualists as **Henry Harrison Brown, T. J. Shelton, and William Walker Atkinson**, I have to "laff right out in meetin'." How did they ever hypnotize us into permitting them to wish this thing upon us?

Seriously, though, isn't that title "Honorary President" the funniest thing you ever saw? The only thing that I know of that comes even near it is that garage sign in Kankakee, which reads thusly: "**John Sparrowhawk, Proprietor; Peter Tibbitts, Assistant Proprietor!**" It is worthy of Gilbert and Sullivan's operas—the "Mikado" contained nothing more characteristic of those gentlemen, in the way of official titles. Shades of Pooh Bah!

Verily, it is to laugh!

THE CASE OF ARTHUR CRANE

A number of our friends have written us calling our attention to the fact that Arthur Crane, of San Francisco, has been indicted and held under bond by the Federal Grand Jury of that city, on the charge of having violated the Postal Laws of the United States. Some of the correspondents call our attention to the fact that Mr. Crane had advertised his book, "The Great Exorcism" in several numbers of this magazine; and evidently wish to warn us against accepting any more advertisements from this source.

Now, I wish to say here that I know nothing of the merits or demerits of the legal proceedings against Mr. Crane. He may have violated the Postal Laws, or he may have not—that is a matter for the court and jury to decide. Every man is entitled to be presumed innocent, until he is proved guilty. There have been charlatans taking shelter under the cloak of Metaphysical Healing, who have been justly haled before the courts; and, on the other hand, there have been instances in which Metaphysical Healers of good character have like-

wise been brought into court, by reason of bigotry, persecution, or misunderstanding. I do not undertake to pass judgment upon the particular case before us, for I am not familiar with the facts. Let us suspend judgment and withhold condemnation in this case.

I wish to say here, however, that over a month ago—about the first of February, to be exact—the publishers of this magazine, acting upon my advice, declined to carry further advertising for Mr. Crane (for reasons which will appear a little further on), although other magazines of good standing were carrying the advertisements regularly. We wrote the advertising agency declining the two-months full-page advertisements offered to us; saying that we had received complaints regarding the proposition. Mr. Crane then personally wrote us asking for particulars, and requesting an opportunity to explain any complaints—he seemed to think that the complaints had to do with some failure on his part to answer letters, etc. I answered his letter as follows:

February 19, 1917.

Dear Mr. Crane:

Replying to yours of 12th inst., concerning the matter of complaints from our subscribers regarding your advertisement, we would say that the complaints referred to, had no connection with any failure on your part to answer letters, send books, etc. Instead, the complaints were along the lines that your book, and the letters addressed to the purchasers thereof, were calculated to arouse and encourage FEAR and TERROR in the minds of those reading the same, by reason of your teachings regarding EVIL INFLUENCES, etc. Inasmuch as our editor has insistently preached that there was nothing to fear in this direction; that the whole thing is a matter of adverse suggestion and auto-suggestion; and that such teachings were harmful and injurious to the minds of those who accepted such suggestions; we cannot consistently carry advertisements in which the very same teachings are set forth with such force and persistency. We do not attempt to say what others should teach; nor do we necessarily agree with the teachings of every book that is advertised in our columns; but a number of our subscribers think that we are inconsistent in publishing your advertisements while we have, and shall in the future, vigorously combatted such teachings. It is not merely a question of difference in teachings in this particular case, but rather a question of our accepting money for advertisements of teachings which we positively hold to be injurious and harmful—and we are inclined to agree with our subscribers in the matter. The case in our opinion, is akin to that of an anti-liquor magazine printing advertisements of a choice brand of Whiskey, if you will pardon the comparison. We should not have accepted the ad. in the first place, had we realized the nature of the proposition; some of our folks had read, and liked, your "All Mysteries"—but this last work is certainly a far cry from your previous ones. This letter is not intended as a criticism of your work—we have no desire to tell you or anyone else what to write or not to write, nor to act as censors in any way; what we have said is merely in re-

sponse to your letter concerning our decision about accepting the advertisement in the future.

Respectfully,

ADVANCED THOUGHT PUBLISHING CO.

To the above letter, Mr. Crane replied as follows:

San Francisco, February 23, 1917.

Advanced Thought Publishing Co.,

Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:

I was glad to get your letter of the 19th inst., because it enables me to direct my explanation to the point you have in mind. I am sure no one who carefully reads the book I am now sending out could say that it was calculated to arouse or encourage fear. On the contrary, I have always taught that every superstition or fear could be exorcised, and that there was positively nothing to fear in that or any other direction. It may be that someone, misunderstanding the first chapter of the book which I was sending out two years ago, and reading no further, would believe that if they had read further they would have been frightened, but that is as near as anyone ever came to be frightened by my book. I sent you a copy of the book for review, and I regret that you did not even read it to judge for yourself whether it created fear or banished fear. Everyone who reads it through and writes to me, says that it banished fear completely. For instance I have received today the enclosed letter from _____, who wrote to me for the book from seeing my name in your magazine, and this is a fair sample of more than one thousand letters. Please return this letter to me, and very much oblige.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR CRANE.

To this letter I replied as follows:

Chicago, February 27, 1917.

Dear Mr. Crane.

Your letter of 23rd inst. has been handed me for attention. I may say that I, personally, am responsible for the letter of 19th inst., to which you refer. Moreover, I consider that if I erred at all, it was in the direction of mildness. I never received the copy of your book which you say you sent us for review; but I have seen a copy of your "Great Exorcism" which one of our subscribers had purchased from you, and I think that the contents of the book fully justifies the criticism that I have directed against it. I see no reason to change my mind regarding the matter of accepting further advertisements for this book, upon the grounds previously stated. I also inform you that I contemplate publishing an article, or a series of articles, in our magazine, to be written by myself, especially directed against this class of FEAR-THOUGHT-producing suggestions in books, magazine articles and lectures. I consider such suggestions to be in the nature of Mental Poison to those accepting them as true. While I do not wish to impute other than honest convictions and worthy motives to you in writing and publishing the work in question, I cannot in honesty to myself refrain from saying that to even the most superficial student of the subject of Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion it must be apparent that such forceful statements concerning EVIL INFLUENCES (in

short, Demonology in disguise, and thinly disguised at that), if accepted by the person reading them, cannot help filling the mind of such person with FEARTHOUGHT of an active kind. If the publishers of this magazine should insist upon accepting your advertisement "over my head" (though I have no fear of this) I should insist upon neutralizing, so far as possible, the effect of your advertisement by writing a ten page article against it, to be inserted in the number of the magazine carrying the ad.,—and then handing in my resignation as editor. I am not attempting to preach to you, or to unfairly criticise your views (I am not given to this sort of thing, as you are probably aware); but I wish to state my position fairly and squarely to you, in such a manner that you cannot well mistake my meaning. In my opinion, the acceptance of your advertisements is a matter entirely for the exercise of my own good judgment, guided by my convictions concerning this class of teachings and my knowledge of the psychology of Suggestion—and I have exercised it in the manner stated. I trust that in the future you will not favor us with further advertising of this kind, and will excuse us from a further discussion of the matter. I herewith return the letter you enclosed—it has not changed my opinion.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM WALKER ATKINSON.

From the copies of San Francisco papers sent me by some of our subscribers, I take it that Mr. Crane was indicted about the first of March. The newspapers sent me contain the following extract from the indictment of the Federal Grand Jury:

"That the said Arthur Crane is the author of books and other forms of literature, letters and advertising matter in which he attributes all human suffering, physical and mental defects and imperfections, and corpulence, to certain 'mysterious influences' which dominate human beings; that when said influences once possess or obsess one, every ray of light becomes darkened, and the individual who absorbs said mysterious influences becomes the servant and tool of said influences and his very soul becomes tainted; that said influences are worse than any physical snake. That the venom was poison to their careers and opportunities, as well as to their physical life and to their soul; the air full of currents of malice, circling round and round, more poisonous than any spider weaving her web, like a spell. These influences are always inventing causes of hatred and revenge, marking them as their victim. That when said influences make their attacks nothing can save their victims except the 'Christ Power'. That purity, prayer, fasting or high resolves are useless, and for the victim of these influences to reject the help held out by said Arthur Crane would be equal to a refusal to wear a pair of strong boots if one were walking in a jungle grass full of deadly snakes. That the said Arthur Crane pretends and claims to be possessed of supernatural powers, to be a public benefactor and a counselor of the Supreme Court of the United States; that the doctrine advanced in the books written by him was and is the result of an inspiration, and because of the powers which he possessed and now possesses, he has performed and can now perform miraculous and instantaneous cures; that the said cures were and are effected by said Arthur Crane imparting and transmitting to his subject the 'Christ Power.'"

I do not wish to appear as "hitting a man when he is down." I do not wish to appear as misjudging Mr. Crane, or any one else. But inasmuch as the advertisement was carried in this magazine, and as there has been a criticism of this magazine because of this fact, I have thought it proper to make public mention of the case, and to reproduce the above correspondence, etc. The fact that Mr. Crane has been indicted for violation of the Postal Laws has had absolutely no effect upon my judgment and opinion of the character of his teachings. His acquittal would not weaken such opinion and judgment; nor would his conviction strengthen them. My judgment and opinion are based upon the character of the teachings, without regard to the character, intentions, or sincerity of the man, or of any possible result of the legal proceedings against him. I do not think it necessary to add anything further to what I have said above, except to say that I had intended printing in this number of the magazine an article directed against this class of teaching—the above takes its place and serves the same purpose.

ABOUT NUMEROLOGY

I take pleasure in introducing to our readers Mr. Clifford W. Cheasley of New York City, the well-known writer and teacher of the subject of Numerology, or "The Science of Number Vibration," who has promised to give us a series of articles upon his favorite subject, the first article appearing in the present number.

I do not know a thing about Numerology—haven't had time to seriously consider its claim and principles—but many of my friends are interested in the subject, and think that "there's a great deal of good in it." And, so I have thought it well to give you a chance to find out something regarding this interesting subject which is attracting so much attention at this time.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Allow me to present Mr. Clifford W. Cheasley, who will now tell us all about the Science of Numbers!

GESUNDHEIT!

No, it is not true that our Mr. Frederick Vollrath departed for the Fatherland with Count von Bernstoff and his attending consular officials and suite. Mr. Vollrath is still with us—he is a good American (no hyphen) who has been in this country for many years, and hopes to stay here many years longer. His German head makes him efficient; and his American heart makes him loyal to his Uncle Sammy. He will resume his interesting series articles on Mental-Physical Culture in our next issue. I am sure that they will prove interesting. He practices what he preaches, and preaches what he practices. He sends the message of "Gesundheit!" to all of you.

"Questions and Answers"

Conducted by the Editor

In this department the editor publishes and answers communications from the readers of this magazine. Its pages are open to all honest inquirers who ask questions on subjects in which they are interested for the purpose of getting information, or being "set straight" on any points which have perplexed them. No attention, however, will be paid to communications obviously intended to exploit pet fads of the writers, or to abuse or revile the honest opinions of others. It is understood, of course, that the subjects of the questions shall come within the general field and scope of this magazine, as indicated by our title page. The subjects of Economics, Sociology, Politics, etc., are out of our field, please remember. Make your inquiries as clear, concise and practical as possible, and the editor will do his best to give them the consideration that they merit. The names of inquirers will not be printed, nor need they be given in full if inquirers prefer it—initials serve every purpose in the case.

RECONCILIATION

J. L. C. writes: "How do you reconcile the teachings set forth in the 'Restored New Testament,' by James Morgan Pryse, and the teachings as set forth in 'Mystic Christianity,' by Yogi Ramacharaka? I have been unable to reconcile the two, and if you can give me any light on the subject I will surely appreciate it."

My dear boy, I am not in the reconciling business. Moreover, one of the books you mention (the first one) I have never even glanced at—the loss is mine, no doubt, but I can't read everything in print, you know. It keeps me pretty busy trying to reconcile some of my present statements and ideas with those which I expressed several years back—generally I make no attempt to do so, for I realize that I am growing and gaining in experience, and naturally getting new ideas and fresh insight into things.

This idea of "reconciling" things seems to be a hobby of some folks (oh, no, I am not speaking of you, my good correspondent); they spend so much time trying to detect different shades of opinion in the writings and expressed ideas of authors and speakers that they fail to catch the spirit of the thought at all. Not content with that, they harp upon the irreconcilable differences which they think that they detect between different writers or thinkers. They should realize that there are as many different angles of thought and expression as there are individuals in the world.

Let a thousand men witness an occurrence, and each one of the thousand will relate the happening in a different manner—often in direct contradiction and opposition. More than this, as live thinkers advance, they change their angle of vision and thought—they frequently contradict themselves. This is natural; Life is a flowing stream, not a stagnant pool.

Look for points of agreement, friend J. L. C., rather than points of irreconcilable difference—and you'll travel further and learn more. The one is the positive way, the other the negative. Remember, finally, that as every good lawyer knows, when a number of witnesses agree upon every detail of the story they tell in common, then look out for collusion and perjury—truth-

ful witnesses differ widely in their perception and recital of details of testimony. Any legal text-book on the subject of "Evidence" will bear me out in this. So true is this, in fact, that it is accepted as axiomatic among authorities on legal evidence. But, as I have already said, in the case you mention I cannot help you out, for the reasons given.

A DETAIL OF HEALING

F. H. writes: "When you give a mental treatment to another person, that takes energy and vitality from the healer, does it not? Well, then, how is the healer to gain it back so that he will feel all right after the treatment?"

No, I do not think that a true mental healing treatment takes energy or vitality from the healer; at least, not more so than any other kind of mental work in which the attention is concentrated. The exercise of concentrated attention is, of course, usually more or less tiresome. The rule in such cases is to direct the attention to something as different as possible for the things upon which it has just been concentrated—the change in the direction of the attention relieves the strain and causes the tired feeling to disappear. A little walk out of doors, a little gazing at distant scenes, a little breathing of nature's fresh air—all these things will be found to relieve that tired feeling. You do not give energy and vitality from your store to the other person, in true mental healing—rather do you arouse the vitality and energy within himself, and set it to work. You do not give Life—you awaken it from its trance into which it has been hypnotized by adverse thinking. See the difference?

PSYCHIC PHENOMENA

H. D. W. writes: "Why or how is it that my wife is called several weeks before a death occurs among our relations? The voice seems to come out of the air, and has been so loud that her sister heard it."

I cannot give you the information you seek. Your spiritualistic friends will give you one explanation; and the psychic research folks will give you another. Some of the theosophical books go into this subject at considerable length. Whatever may be the real explanation, I am satisfied that it will be found to be "natural" and not super-natural. There are many natural laws of which we have but slight knowledge. I think that in the field of the subconscious planes of mind are to be found the explanations for many phases of phenomena which are usually regarded as super-natural. I believe in exhausting all possible natural explanations before we seek our answer in the super-natural. The field of the natural grows day by day, as we discover its laws; and the fence of the super-natural is constantly being pushed further back as the natural gains the ground formerly occupied by it. The super-natural is usually but the natural, imperfectly understood.

WAS HOMER INSPIRED?

S. L. L. writes: "Was Homer an inspired epic writer similar to Vyasa? In answering this question, would it not be well to weigh the low vibrations used in the translation of Homer?"

If by inspiration is meant the theological conception of "a divine super-natural influence on the prophets, apostles, or sacred writers, by which they were qualified to communicate moral or religious truths with authority," then I cannot answer your question, for I am no authority on that phase of mental or spiritual phenomena. The theologians have a monopoly on this kind of

information, but, alas! they seem to draw the line of inspiration closely around their own favored "holy men," and rule out of the ring all the "holy men" of the other religions—so it is difficult to get the real facts of the case from them.

If, however, by inspiration you mean "act or power of exercising an elevating or stimulating influence upon the intellect or emotions, the result of such influence, the influence which quickens or stimulates," then I should say that all the great writers and poets who stir men's minds and feelings are more or less "inspired." But, even so, I think that the inspiration comes from within, rather than from without.

After all, brother, would we not do better to consider whether a writer inspires us to be stronger, better and more efficient, than to speculate concerning whether or not he himself was inspired by super-natural authority? If he inspires you in this way, you may rest assured that he himself was inspired from within. Outward things do not inspire us for that matter; they merely cause us to be inspired from within ourselves, by awakening "something within us." And I think that probably this is exactly what the old prophets meant when they said they were "inspired"—although the theologians would have us believe otherwise. "We are greater than we know"—there are planes of life and mind and Spirit within us, from which sometimes wells up "inspiration." I don't think that the good old Hebrew prophets had any monopoly on inspiration—or those old Hindu sages, either. Nor do I believe that the inspiration market was cornered by the ancients at all, for that matter; the spring is still bubbling—let us seek it and drink of its waters, comrades!

NEW THOUGHT AND "THE SABBATH"

H. L. B. writes: "What is the general New Thought conception of Sunday? In other words—the interpretation of the fourth commandment. What do some of the advanced thinkers feel (in a concrete way) constitutes the 'breaking of the Sabbath' and what is the Sabbath?"

How can I answer this question, friend? There is no "official" New Thought to pass upon the subject; neither is there any "creed" or "authoritative doctrine" in New Thought; nor has the belief on the subject been "standardized"—as yet. I should say that each and every individual New Thinker settles this question for himself, or herself—according to his or her own thought, feelings or general habit or custom. I imagine that many good New Thinkers "keep" Sunday as the Sabbath, with more or less form or ceremony. I imagine that some other New Thinkers—who happen to be Jewish or "Seventh Day" observers—keep Saturday as the Sabbath, in the same way. And I imagine that a still greater number prefer to "remember the seven days, and keep them ALL holy; for every day is the Sabbath of the Lord!"

I do not think that you will find many "hide bound" observers of the Sabbath among New Thinkers, however. I think that most of them believe that the best way to observe that day is to get out into God's sunshine and open air, and to worship at his shrine set up in Nature, or to obtain recreation in other rational ways. I think that most of the New Thinkers have shed their Puritanical conceptions of Sabbath observance—but, still, there is no rule in the case to govern them; there is no New Thought Creed to bind them. In connection with this subject, I would refer you to the December, 1916, issue of this magazine—read the answer entitled "Which Day is the Sabbath?" on page 502 of that issue.

GOOD STUFF

Bozeman writes: "I am sending you a thought: Let each man work for right in his own particular field, and then the propagandist will suddenly find himself out of a job."

Good stuff, brother. Let's all get busy. I never did have much really-and-truly sympathy for the professional reformer, or the one-idea propagandist; though I suppose that these, too, have their places in the Whole Thing. Those people generally stimulate me to action—in the opposite direction; just to maintain a balance, probably.

THE EDITOR IS SAT UPON

J. E. B. writes: "Your writings remind me of a Baby or a Smart Aleck! In the October issue of 'Advanced Thought' (!) you misquote the lines of an acquaintance of mine, and also call them 'the old jingle'—'great fleas have little fleas,' etc. In the November number, on page 441 you say: 'It is possible to prove anything from the righteousness of slavery to the practice of polygamy, by reference to Bible texts interpreted to suit the case.' I consider your lack of reason and intelligence to be almost as surprising as your own statement given above is false. In your magazine is exhibited a poor grade of thought on an exceptionally low plane."

Thanks, good brother! You apply the customary theological argument, i. e., that of "calling the other fellow names" when you cannot advance logical rejoinders. You tell me nothing new about myself or my works. I have heard the same thing several times—but from my ecclesiastical friends only, as a general rule. In fact, you have been quite moderate in your denunciations, compared to most of 'em. What is it that "churchy" folks feed upon that makes 'em manifest such shrewish tempers? Or is it that this is the result of too much talk about "brotherly love"—a reaction from too much sweetness, as it were? I have often wondered at this—human nature is a queer thing!

Bless the dear man—he thinks that I was attacking his Bible! Instead of that I was merely calling attention to the fact that one can "prove" (!) almost anything by quoting Scripture and interpreting (!) it to fit the case—a fact generally admitted, I thought, and still think.

So far as the "righteousness of slavery" and "the practice of polygamy" are concerned, both have been repeatedly proved (!) in this way, to the satisfaction of preachers and congregations. One has but to pick up some of the books, or newspapers, published before the Civil War (or during it), to see what a strong case some of the southern orthodox clergymen made of the "righteousness of slavery"—scores of texts were used, and apparently logical arguments built up from them. And, as for the "practice of polygamy," one has but to read some of the old Mormon literature, in which numerous texts from the orthodox Bible are quoted to prove the case.

Of course, any sensible person knows that nothing is really proved in this way; all that is accomplished is to show that the old Hebrew patriarchs practiced polygamy, and were slave-owners, according to the established custom of their times and lands—that's all. Murder, rape and many other practices now considered shocking, can be proved (!) in the same way—but what of it? These things have nothing to do with modern conditions. The thing is too silly to discuss seriously; but it seems necessary to say something in the cases of good people like this good brother. This quoting of old Scriptural texts to prove (!) pet theories is silly; almost as silly as to deny that practically anything can be proved (!) in this way, by interpreting (!) the text to suit one's own case.

I'm really sorry about that mistake about the fleas, though. Now, that really bothers me, while the other things merely amuse me, or simply "make me tired." Poor misquoted fleas! Here follows the correct version:

"Great fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite 'em,
And little fleas have lesser fleas, and so on ad infinitum;
And the great fleas, themselves in turn, have greater fleas to go on,
While these again have greater still, and greater still, and so on."

This is, indeed, an "old jingle," quoted by de Morgan in 1850 from someone long before his time. And even this, old as it is, was evidently adapted from the well-known lines of Dean Swift who died in 1745. So our good brother J. E. B. must be a very old man, indeed, for the author of the "jingle" to be "an acquaintance of mine."

THE ROOT OF EVIL

C. S. C. writes: "I find that the greatest sin in the world, and that the keynote of what is wrong with the world is this: There is too much living according to the letter of the law, and not enough living according to the Spirit of Truth!"

Amen, sister! And this is true in the field of New Thought, as well as in the field of Old Thought. The spirit of a thing is its life, essence, and being; the letter is merely its husk, useful for the purposes of holding things together and for similar offices, but harmful when allowed to cramp, confine and dwarf the inner thing; or when it is mistaken for the real thing, instead of being seen to be merely its overcoat.

POSITIVITY

A. A. G. writes: "Just what characteristics would you look for in a truly strong and positive individual? Is there not a danger of mistaking an arrogant or domineering attitude for one of positivity? In other words, is great self-assertion and ultra-aggressiveness always a mark of positivity?"

Offhand, I should say that the principal characteristics of the really strong and truly positive individual are: (1) a strong will; (2) self-mastery; (3) a well-balanced mind; (4) controlled emotions; (5) a calm, well-poised manner. Certainly I should not consider bluster, arrogance and a domineering manner to be the characteristics of such an individual; but rather the characteristics of one not sure of himself, a "bluffer" or "four flusher," to use the popular terms. The truly strong and positive individual does not need to display undue self-assertion or ultra-aggressiveness of manner—he gravitates to his position of power without these things. There is a peculiar simplicity of manner about most of the world's truly great men—this accompanied by a manifestation of power which is felt by others rather than seen or heard. There are, of course, apparent exceptions to this rule; but the rule is clearly defined and stated, nevertheless, and most of the world's strongest characters come under it.

ANTI-HYPNOTISM

E. S. writes: "I have read considerable on the subject of hypnotism, a subject which interests me. I have read considerable on the subject, and have gotten the idea that hypnotism must be an agency for immense good as well as harm. For this reason I am somewhat surprised that your magazine gives

it no attention, and I am wondering what your reasons may be for not referring to it. I ask that you give me your criticism relative to the desirability of hypnotic practice."

I do not publish articles on the subject of hypnotism, because I consider that the hypnotic state is an abnormal psychological state. All that is good that can be secured by the practice of hypnotism, may be equally well secured by means of ordinary suggestion scientifically administered, or even by other methods of mental treatment. The hypnotic state is merely a condition in which a suggestion has an exaggerated effect—and the condition is clearly abnormal. Moreover, like all abnormal psychic conditions, this state tends to produce undue sensitiveness to suggestions; and also other undesirable psychic results, in my opinion. I know that many authorities hold otherwise, but I have very good reasons for holding to the above conclusions—I am speaking from experience, and not from mere theory or the opinions of others. While some good sometimes may be derived from suggestions given to one in the hypnotic state, still, I do not think that the end justifies the means in the ordinary run of cases. A man may perform some worthy act (such as acts of charity, etc.), while he is drunk—but would you advise the practice of making men drunk in order to persuade them to perform kindly acts? Beautiful poems have been written by persons addicted to the use of narcotics—but should one take narcotics in order to cultivate the poetic temperament and talent? Hypnotism is psychic intoxication or drugging—and is open to the same objections as ordinary intoxication or the drugged condition. All my thought is directed to the opposite pole of mental power—that of awakening people from their hypnotic trances and "psychic jags." Don't try to put people asleep—try to make them wide awake!

SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

E. S. L. writes: "How can the antagonism throughout the universe be reconciled with Universal Love? To quote Darwin: 'every organic being naturally increases at so high a rate that, if not destroyed, the earth would soon be covered by the progeny of a single pair.' In result, there is a fierce struggle for existence. True that the survival of the fittest tends to the betterment of the race, but the feebler individual must be annihilated all the same, by his opponents."

I do not know the answer in this case. Or rather, I do not know just how to express my own general thought on the subject in such a way as not to be misunderstood. So far as concerns the Darwinian idea you quote, I would say that there is another natural law which most writers seem to ignore. This law seems to be that of Balance. Balance causes the excessive rate of reproduction which is manifested by those living creatures which are in great danger of being destroyed by their natural enemies; take away these enemies, and the creatures increase rapidly for a while, but then sooner or later comes something unusual to reduce their number; and later on, their rate of reproductive increase seems to decrease—Balance asserts itself in both directions, you see. There seems to be a Constructive phase of Nature, and a Destructive phase—the two poles of activity. And there is always to be seen a shifting (but continuous) action of Balance between the two. Why? Ah, why indeed? Do we know the real and complete "why and wherefore" of anything? We know much about the "how"—but when it comes to the "why" the wisest confesses his ignorance, and is not ashamed to do so. But there is no such hesitancy manifested by the half-wise, or the wholly ignorant—such have no doubt whatsoever!

FAITH AND BIGOTRY

H. P. H. writes: "What is the difference between Faith and Bigotry? Are they not essentially one and the same thing, i. e., 'Confident belief in that which is not seen, is unrealized and unknown—blind attachment to a certain thing or course?' Are we not making a distinction where there is no real ob-difference?"

I have always thought that there was a very wide difference between these two terms, and never have thought of them as being synonymous. Faith is defined as: "(1) Reliance on testimony; belief; (2) Firm belief, resting on probable evidence, in regard to important moral truth; (3) That which is believed on any subject, as a system of religious belief." An authority says: "Faith is (1) the assent of the mind to what is stated or put forward by another; trust or confidence in the veracity or authority of another; firm and earnest belief in the statements or propositions of another on the ground of manifest truth of that which he utters; hence (2) that which is believed on any subject in science, politics or religion; a doctrine or system of doctrines believed in and held; a creed." In its special usage, the term Faith is employed to designate earnest belief based upon the statements of those believed to possess authority to announce truth, as distinguished from knowledge arrived at by the exercise of one's own reason, or derived from actual personal experience.

Bigotry, on the other hand, is defined as: "The obstinate and blind devotion to one's own church, or to one's own party, faction, sect, etc.; blind and obstinate adherence to one's own belief, faith or opinion, accompanied by intolerance of any other." The term "bigotry" has for its synonyms the following terms: "prejudiced, intolerant, narrow-minded, etc." An authority says: "A bigot is one who is unreasonably wedded to one's own opinions on religious or other matters, and disposed to think hardly of, and if opportunity arises, to persecute those whose views differ from his own." The application of the term carries with it the implication that the bigoted person is so blindly and obstinately attached to his own opinions, beliefs and faith, that he is not open to ordinary reasonable argument or proof to the contrary; and that he is also intolerant of opposing views held by others.

So, it seems to me that there is decided distinction between the two terms, and their application. One may possess Faith, and yet not be Bigoted; though one cannot well be Bigoted and yet be lacking in Faith.

FOUR STAGES OF BELIEF

There are four stages between belief and utter disbelief. There are those who believe in God; those who doubt Him, like Huxley; those who deny Him, like the atheists, but do at least keep the site vacant; and lastly, those who have set up a Church in His place—that is the last outrage of unbelief.

—H. G. WELLS.

Old-New Thought

In this department the editor invites you to enjoy with him certain selections from some of the older writers. Some of the best New Thought is very old indeed. Truth knows no time or country. New Thought is a state of mind, rather than a set creed, you must remember. The inspired writers of a thousand years ago, and the illumined writers of today, are contemporaries in New Thought—they live in the same thought and feeling, though they are separated by the years.

SELF-RELIANCE

By Ralph Waldo Emerson

(Continued from February Number)

All my wilful actions and acquisitions are but roving;—the most trivial reverie, the faintest native emotion are domestic and divine.

Thoughtless people contradict as readily the statement of perceptions as of opinions, or rather much more readily; for, they do not distinguish between perception and notion. They fancy that I choose to see this or that thing. But perception is not whimsical, but fatal.

If I see a trait, my children will see it after me, and in course of time, all mankind—although it may chance that no one has seen it before me.

For my perception of it is as much a fact as the sun.

The relations of the soul to the divine spirit are so pure that it is profane to seek to interpose helps. It must be that when God speaketh, he should communicate not one thing, but all things; should fill the world with his voice; should scatter forth light, nature, time, souls, from the center of the present thought; and new date and new create the whole.

Whenever a mind is simple, and receives a divine wisdom, then old things pass away—means, teachers, texts, temples fall; it lives now and absorbs past and future into the present hour. All things are made sacred by relation to it, —one thing as much as another.

All things are dissolved to their center by their cause, and in the universal miracle petty and particular miracles disappear. This is and must be.

If, therefore, a man claims to know and speak of God, and carries you backward to the phraseology of some old mouldered nation in another country, in another world, believe him not.

Is the acorn better than the oak which is its fulness and completion?

Is the parent better than the child into whom he has cast his ripened being?

Whence then this worship of the past?—

The centuries are conspirators against the sanity and majesty of the soul.

Time and space are but physiological colors which the eye maketh, but the soul is light; where it is, is day; where it was, is night; and history is an impertinence and an injury, if it be anything more than cheerful apologue or parable of my being and becoming.

Man is timid and apologetic. He is no longer upright. He dares not say, "I think," "I am," but quotes some saint or sage. He is ashamed before the blade of grass or the blowing rose. These roses under my window make no reference to former roses or to better ones; they are for what they are; they exist with God today. There is no time to them. There is simply the rose;

it is perfect in every moment of its existence. Before a leaf-bud has burst, its whole life acts; in the full-blown flower, there is no more; in the leafless root, there is no less. Its nature is satisfied, and it satisfies nature, in all moments alike. There is no time to it.

But man postpones or remembers; he does not live in the present, but with reverted eye laments the past, or, heedless of the riches that surround them, stands on tiptoe to foresee the future.

He cannot be happy and strong until he too lives with nature in the present, above time.

This should be plain enough. Yet see what strong intellects dare not yet hear God himself, until he speak the phraseology of I know not what David, or Jeremiah, or Paul.

We shall not always set so great a price on a few texts, on a few lives.

We are like children who repeat by rote the sentences of grandames and tutors, and, as they grow older, of the men of talents and character they chance to see—painfully recollecting the exact words they spoke; afterward, when they come into the point of view which those had who uttered these sayings, they understand them, and are willing to let the words go; for, at any time they can use words as good when occasion comes.

So was it with us, so will it be if we proceed.

If we live truly we shall see truly.

It is as easy for the strong man to be strong as it is for the weak to be weak. When we have new perception, we shall gladly disburden the memory of its hoarded treasures as old rubbish.

When a man lives with God his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn.

And now at last the highest truth on this subject remains unsaid; probably, cannot be said; for all that we say is the far off remembering of the intuition. That thought, by what I can now nearest approach to say, is this:

When good is near you, when you have life in yourself—it is not by any known or appointed way; you shall not discern the footprints of any other; you shall not see the face of man; you shall not hear any name;—the way, the thought, the good shall be wholly strange and new. It shall exclude all other being. You take the way from man not to man. All persons that ever existed are its fugitive ministers. There shall be no fear in it. Fear and hope are alike beneath it. It asks nothing. There is somewhat low even in hope. We are then in vision. There is nothing that can be called gratitude nor properly joy. The soul is raised over passion. It seeth identity and eternal causation. It is a perceiving that Truth and Right are. Hence it becomes a Tranquillity out of the knowing that all things go well. Vast spaces of nature; the Atlantic Ocean, the South Sea; vast intervals of time, years, centuries are of no account. This which I think and feel, underlay that former state of life and circumstances, as it does underlie my present, and will always all circumstance, and what is called life, and what is called death.

Life only avails, not the having lived.

Power ceases in the instant of repose; it resides in the moment of transition from a past to a new state; in the shooting of the gulf; in the darting to an aim. This one fact the world hates, that the soul becomes; for, that forever degrades the past; turns riches to poverty; all reputation to a shame, confounds the saint with the rogue; shoves Jesus and Judas equally aside.

Why then do we prate of self-reliance?

Inasmuch as the soul is present, there will be power not confident, but

agent. To talk of reliance, is a poor external way of speaking. Speak rather of that which relies, because it works and is.

Who has more soul than I, masters me, though he should not raise his finger. Round him I must revolve by the gravitation of spirits; who has less, I rule with like facility.

We fancy it rhetoric when we speak of eminent virtue. We do not yet see that virtue is Height, and that a man or a company of men plastic and permeable to principles, by the law of nature must overpower and ride all cities, nations, kings, rich men, poets, who are not.

This is the ultimate fact which we so quickly reach on this as on every topic, the resolution of all into the ever blessed One.

Virtue is the governor, the creator, the reality.

All things real are so by so much virtue as they contain.

Hardship, husbandry, hunting, whaling, war, eloquence, personal weight, are somewhat, and engage my respect as examples of the soul's presence*and impure action.

I see the same law working in nature for conservation and growth. The poise of a planet, the bended tree recovering itself from the strong wind, the vital resources of every vegetable and animal, are also demonstrations of the self-sufficing, and therefore self-relying soul.

All history from its highest to its trivial passages is the various record of this power.

Thus all concentrates; let us not rove; let us sit at home with the cause. Let us stun and astonish the intruding rabble of men and books and institutions by a simple declaration of the divine fact. Bid them take the shoes from off their feet, for God is here within. Let our simplicity judge them, and our docility to our own law demonstrate the poverty of nature and fortune beside our native riches.

But now we are a mob. Man does not stand in awe of man, nor is the soul admonished to stay at home, to put itself in communication with the internal ocean, but it goes abroad to beg a cup of water of the urns of men.

We must go alone. Isolation must precede true society.

I like the silent church before the service begins, better than any preaching. How far off, how cool, how chaste the persons look, begirt each one with a precinct or sanctuary. So let us always sit.

Why should we assume the faults of our friend, or wife, or father, or child, because they sit around our hearth, or are said to have the same blood?

All men have my blood, and I have all men's.

Not for that will I adopt their petulance or folly, even to the extent of being ashamed of it.

But your isolation must not be mechanical, but spiritual, that is, must be elevation. At times the whole world seems to be in conspiracy to importune you with emphatic trifles. Friend, client, child, sickness, fear, want, charity, all knock at once at thy closet door and say, "Come out unto us." Do not spill thy soul; do not all descend; keep thy state; stay at home in thine own heaven; come not for a moment into their facts, into their hubbub of conflicting appearances, but let in the light of thy law on their confusion.

The power men possess to annoy me, I give them by a weak curiosity.

No man can come near me but through my act.

"What we love that we have, but by desire we bereave ourselves of the love."

(TO BE CONTINUED)



Harmony and Health for You

The Keystone of the Great Arch of Life, and the Keynote of THE WAY OF LIFE SYSTEM. Into this Arch of Life—into every cell—you can build Health, Success, Opulence and all Good. That is, you can have Health, Harmony, Supreme Mind Control, "Educated" Vital Organs, Energized Blood, and Vitalized Brain, Nerve and Muscle Cells—

Mind Aflame — Heart Aglow — Body Atingle

I don't think so—I know it. For I have helped many thousands, and without drugs, torturous exercises, fasting, apparatus, dieting or fads.

I teach this exclusively personal Harmony and Health System, by correspondence. I will tell you all about this Science of Health and Fine Art of Living; as well as my price and terms. Also let me tell you about Vitalizing, Nerve Stretching, Human Electricity, your "Tubes," your "Invisible Blood," my lessons in Harmonious Eating, my Vital Force Generator, Brain Building, Muscle Building, Mastery of your Regenerative Forces, the "Cosmo-Phone"—and very much more, in my illustrated book, "HARMONY AND HEALTH." Critics say that it is a gem. Yours for 4c in stamps to help in the mailing.

Twenty successful years. Certainty of satisfaction. **Get the book and you'll be glad.**

Prof. EARL WARD PEARCE, - - - The Pearce Studio, Dept. 56, Los Angeles, U. S. A.

THE VAN VALEN SANATORIUM

is where the most chronic cases of mental, nervous, functional diseases and addictions are cured. If failed upon elsewhere, come here. Mental and Spiritual treatment. Booklet. Peekskill-on-Hudson, N. Y.

BOOKS! BOOKS!! BOOKS!!!

All kinds of occult, mystical, Yogi and astrological books. Most complete stock in the United States. Write for 125-page descriptive catalog.

THE CURTISS PHILOSOPHIC BOOK CO., Inc.
1731 Chestnut St. - - Philadelphia, Pa.

ONE CASE FREE

I will take ONE CASE, in each neighborhood, no matter what, or how serious, and treat the patient free of charge. "A healed case is my best advertisement." Address, sending stamped envelope, D. C., care of THE GORE BOOK CO., Ruskin, Florida.

CORRECT ENGLISH HOW TO USE IT

JOSEPHINE TURCK BAKER, Editor

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Sample Copy 10c Subscription Price \$2.00 a Year
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

ECZEMA, PSORIASIS

cancer,
goitre,
tetter,

old sores, catarrh, dandruff, sore eyes, rheumatism, neuralgia, stiff joints, piles, cured or no charge. Write for particulars and free samples.

ECZEMA REMEDY CO., Hot Springs, Ark.

Lillian Russell Recommends **Turkish Baths at Home** for Health and Beauty



"The Turkish Bath at Home" is Miss Russell's latest recommendation to all those who read her daily talks in the public press. She tells why we need the Turkish Bath in addition to the regular water bath. And Miss Russell tells how simple and easy it

is to take the Turkish Bath right in your own home.

A Turkish Bath at home costs only 2c with the ROBINSON BATH CABINET

That "tired feeling," exhaustion, lack of energy, often means nothing more than that the pores of your skin need to be opened up and cleared so they can do their natural work. Exhausted men and women have been remarkably strengthened, right at home, in a few minutes' time, by the use of ROBINSON'S Thermal Bath Cabinet. Our big \$2.00 book, "The Philosophy of Health and Beauty," will be given away FREE to readers of this magazine—make sure of your copy by writing today. ROBINSON MFG. CO., 904 N. Twelfth St., TOLEDO, O.

Cancer—Worth Knowing

No need of cutting off a man's nose or cheek or a woman's breast in a vain attempt to cure cancer; no need of submitting to the knife or burning plaster. Frequently one injection, in selected cases, of our Liquid Laboratory Product into the cancer or tumor instantly kills it. Write for booklet to the Indianapolis Cancer Hospital, Indianapolis, Indiana.

NUMEROLOGY

The Universal Adjuster

Do you know

What you appear to be to others?
What you really are?
What you want to be?
What you can be?
What lessons your experiences are trying to teach you?
What would overcome your present and future difficulties?

If not, write now to

CLIFFORD W. CHEASLEY

Philosopher

261-3 West 21st Street NEW YORK CITY

You will receive full particulars of his personal work which is dedicated to your service.

NO PROBLEM IS TOO BIG OR TOO SMALL FOR NUMEROLOGY. UNDERSTANDING WAITS YOU.